The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1921 No. 2935

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 361
EDITORIALS:
Human Nature and Unemployment 364
Lord Curzon Sees Red 365
The Independent Merges 366
JAPAN'S ABSORPTION OF SIBERIA. By Nathaniel Peffer 367
WHY LLOYD GEORGE IS NEGOTIATING WITH DE VALERA. By Lincoln Colcord 369
THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE CONGRESS. By J. P. Warbasse 371
WEST VIRGINIA—INDUSTRIALISM GONE MAD. By Arthur Warner 372
THE HOUSE OF ESAU. By Gilbert Seldes 374
THE PANTOMIME AND THE PICTURE. By Alfred B. Kuttner 375
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 376
CORRESPONDENCE 376
BOOKS:
Facts Made to Order. By George Soule 378
Truth on the Run 379
Books in Brief 380
DRAMA:
The Native Theater. By Ludwig Lewisohn 381
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
Japan in Eastern Siberia 382

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR — CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

IT is well that the churches should observe the day of the opening of the Armaments Conference at Washington as a day of prayer. Some of them might recall an illustration of effective prayer popular in our youth. An old Negro had for many years prayed vainly for a Thanksgiving turkey. Then one year, as he later testified to the edification of the brethren, he quit praying "O Lord send me dat turkey" and prayed instead "O Lord, send me atter dat turkey." He got his turkey. Let the churches begin to pray "O Lord, send us after peace" and something may happen. It is all too evident that somebody will have to do a heap of keeping after the Washington Conference if anything worth while is to happen. The proposed agenda is just the vague, general sort of document with which the elder statesmen like to play in secret conference to the mystification of the people. We are headed straight for a repetition of what happened at Versailles—a reactionary lot of conclusions sweetened by a few pious words, with no choice but to take it or leave it. Open sessions with an informed and determined public might still get us some measure of reduction of armament and some valuable steps toward a Far Eastern understanding.

ORANGEMEN in Belfast and Black and Tans in Cork are doing their best to break the Irish truce. And there is a disquieting note of truculence in recent speeches of British Cabinet Ministers on the Irish question. Perhaps that note is due to the character of the speakers; Mr. Winston Churchill was never cast for the role of peacemaker. But perhaps there is a more serious reason. Mr. Lincoln Colcord elsewhere in this issue cogently states the economic motive behind Britain's peace move. Without it she could not get the financial terms she desires from the United States. But there are signs that irrespective of Ireland all is not well with Britain's American negotiations. A refractory Congress may make the funding of the debt on British terms impossible. And the British have been rather irritated by American opposition to preliminary discussions of the agenda of the Washington Conference. It is also significant that neither Mr. George nor Lord Curzon is to be on the British delegation which will cross the Atlantic. Perhaps, then, the British Cabinet feels that nothing more is to be gained from America by prolonging the Irish discussions. Two things at any rate are certain: (1) America's economic power can be used for peace or war more effectively than most Americans realize; and (2) the Washington Conference is worse than useless if the Irish war is resumed. Pro-Irish feeling may not now be strong enough to carry the American public with it; it is strong enough to block any vital step toward world peace, which in turn is dependent upon Anglo-American friendship. Hence, irrespective of any sentiment of humanity or justice, the profound concern of Americans in the peaceful settlement of the Irish issue.

ALL Americans who want conditions such as those prevailing in Mingo and Logan Counties, West Virginia, to become general will pray for the success of the injunction proceedings brought by the Borderland [Coal] Company to have the United Mine Workers' Union declared "unlawful per se." In fighting this issue conservatives like President Lewis of the miners and Mr. Samuel Gompers will have to fight as bitterly as any I. W. W. The life of the labor movement is imperiled and with it all hope of something like orderly progress in labor matters instead of guerrilla warfare.

EVEN more spectacular than the slave-block of Urbain Ledoux are the methods of the Labor Party Councillors of the borough of Poplar in London. To call public attention to the desperate unemployment situation in their district and to the need of Government action, thirty Councillors, men and women, have gone to jail on a technical charge of contempt, and their going has been accompanied by a storm of parades, speeches, threats of rent and tax strikes, and, in all the poorer boroughs, by protests from bodies of jobless workers against the inadequacy of the relief doles. Poplar is one of the poorest boroughs in London and the total of its unemployed is equalled only by West Ham. In common with the other boroughs it is called upon to pay rates to the London County Council and the Asylum Board and, in addition, to distribute out of local funds the necessary unemployment doles. In theory all boroughs share alike; but a poor borough, where taxes are hard to levy and unemployment is rife, finds itself financially crushed, while the prosperous boroughs have no unemployed. Poplar, with its Labor majority and its Labor mayor, presses for equal distribution of the burden of un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employment relief, increased doles, and extensive public works to provide employment. The Poplar Council, faced with the alternative of paying its share of the rates and neglecting the unemployed, or of providing an adequate dole and appropriating nothing for the County rates, has chosen the latter, and this choice has landed the Labor majority in jail. They have gone willingly, making as much noise about it as possible; and there they intend to stay until something is done about unemployment in London.

IT is probable that Japan has put forward her Shantung offer in the hope that the problem can be settled or be in process of settlement when the Washington conference takes place; and it is plain by the same token that China will do well to refuse it. Whatever may be the specific objections to specific clauses—and those that have been put forward by Chinese critics seem well-founded—the question ought obviously to be open when the discussion at the Armaments Conference turns to the Far East; and China's hands ought not to be tied by any previous commitments or negotiations. The terms as they stand, however, suggest a basis for discussion which might well be adopted by the conferees at Washington. They are not, on the surface, ungenerous and are dangerous more in their reservations and in what is left unsaid than in their concrete proposals. Japan is acting upon her original contention that the Shantung question is one for private settlement between herself and China. China, being the weaker, has been eager to make it a matter for the consideration of the Powers and subject to the general liquidation of war claims. Her hope lies not so much in the conscience or enlightenment of the rest of the world as in the conflict of interests which may result in keeping her out of the clutches of any one contestant—her hope lies here, even though she runs the risk of being torn to pieces in the process.

IF American newspaper correspondents in Europe had a real grasp of the background and intricacies of European politics we might know precisely what is behind the curious series of threatening notes being fired at the Soviet Government, instead of being compelled to guess. Almost simultaneously with Lord Curzon's fulmination against alleged bolshevik intrigue in the East—which may have been intended for effect in India, and may have been a mere attack of nerves, Poland addressed an "ultimatum" to Moscow, demanding fulfilment of the terms of the Treaty of Riga. Now, Poland's note was to have been expected, for Poland herself has been openly and flagrantly violating that treaty herself by harboring Petlura, Bulak-Balakhovich, Savinkov, and other counter-revolutionary conspirators, and Poland's only possible defense is to make counter-charges. But just why should England attack Russia simultaneously with Poland? Hitherto Poland has been playing France's cards, and ever since the days when England opened trade negotiations while France recognized Wrangel, British and French Russian policy have been poles apart. The French radical press has for months been filled with reports of shipments of munitions from France to Poland and Rumania; indeed on one occasion workers in a Roubaix factory struck rather than make shells for counter-revolution. A concentration of Rumanian troops on the Bessarabian frontier was recently reported. Chicherin told Arthur Ransome that he believed all this connoted "the beginning of a new wave of interventionist policy." First-rate unbiased reporters in European capitals would know the truth; we can only guess.

BURGENLAND, like Przemysl and Czenstochowa, is one of those insignificant spots on the mid-European map which never disturbed any American newspaper copy-desk until the by-play of fate brought nations to grips upon its village streets. Burgenland was a bit of western Hungary, inhabited by conservative Catholic Germans, faithful to their king. The Allied treaty with Hungary detached it and presented it to Austria, as an extra bit of hinterland for half-ruined Vienna. But Hungary did not accept the detachment though she signed the treaty; when finally, upon Allied insistence, she withdrew her troops, she left irregular detachments behind which fought the entering Austrians. The Austrians, thoroughly disarmed in accordance with the Treaty of St. Germain, were in no position to cope with the Hungarians, spoiled playthings of the French, who have not yet disarmed as their treaty bade them. So now the Allies repeat an earnest warning to Hungary to be good, and Burgenland continues the prey of irregular Hungarian bandit-troops. Any one of three nearby countries, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, or Italy, could send a handful of troops and restore order in a trice, but no one of the jealous three will let another win that prestige.

FOR some time liberal Americans have had cause to feel the mockery with which the immigrant must look on Liberty's uplifted torch which throws its beams on Ellis Island. So conservative a body as the Merchants Association issued a report condemning the corruption and inhumanity of certain of the permanent officials on the Island; the "three per cent" immigration law is in itself unjust and in the hands of our own bureaucracy and the greedy steamship companies has worked pathetic hardships on men who have sold all to get passage to America. Now comes Remsen Crawford, a contributor to the New York *World*, who has been stationed at Ellis Island for many months, to argue not only that the law was unnecessary to shut off "hordes from Southern Europe" but that it actually operates to discourage the best sort of immigrants. He cites figures to show that the net immigration from Southern Europe before the law went into effect was small—only 20,000 for the month of March—and facts to prove the evil effect of the law upon certain desirable Dutch farmers.

SUCH inequalities between men and women as can be wiped out of existence by laws are pretty well covered in two measures proposed by the National Woman's Party—one a Federal amendment, the other a measure to be introduced in the legislature of every State except Wisconsin which has already adopted it. The amendment would abolish throughout the United States all "political, civil, or legal disabilities or inequalities on account of sex or on account of marriage, unless applying equally to both sexes"; while the measure to be proposed in the State legislatures presents an imposing array of feminist demands. The swift change during the last fifty years in the economic position of women and the final success of their long fight for the vote has led most of us to assume too easily that the job was done; but the relics on the statute books and in the common law of the dreary oppressions of earlier days, varying from State to State but existing in some measure throughout the country, denies the assumption. For instance, in some States a mother has not equal guardianship rights over her children and a married woman cannot freely dispose of her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own earnings. These and other inequalities should be abolished without delay. There will still remain those many subtle but galling inequalities that inhere not in law, but in the age-long prejudices of men and women alike. These will disappear more slowly, but the measures proposed by the National Woman's Party will clear the ground and free the energies of women for the harder task.

THE World's Methodist Conference in session at London went on record in favor of the absolute abolition of armaments and of war. Such is the power of the various Methodist bodies that they could do much to turn their desires into realities. But one's expectation of so glorious a result is not strengthened by reading that Bishop Cannon of America declared that "if another war should come demanding that sons come from prohibition homes in America to fight in England, France, or other countries, one of the most important factors would be whether the American and English or French governments would cooperate to offer the same protection to the American youth from drink as he receives under the American flag." What can we hope from bishops more desirous and expectant of saving the youth of America from French wine than from new war! But far more enlightening as to the present impotence of the great churches was the action of the Colorado Methodist Conference in voting down, 58 to 46, a resolution asking amnesty for American war-time political prisoners. According to the story of the debate in the *Rocky Mountain News* the prevailing arguments rested on the usual conceptions of the requirements of patriotism and regard for the righteousness of the American judiciary. A church which on such utterly secular grounds can vote to keep that great apostle of peace, 'Gene Debs, in jail is equally unfit to serve the cause of world peace or to interpret the spirit of Jesus Christ to the men of this day.

ACCORDING to the Adams County (Indiana) *Witness* a certain "Examiner Jordan" from Chicago declined to grant naturalization papers to eight men in that County because they could not conscientiously bear arms in defense of the United States. This aftermath of the war to end war somewhat troubles the *Witness*. That conception of good Americanism would have barred William Penn as an undesirable alien, deported John Woolman, and put William Lloyd Garrison in jail for life. By contrast it is interesting to note that a radical Welsh constituency recently elected a former conscientious objector to represent it in the British House of Commons.

FROM the proceedings of the Second International Congress of Eugenics the newspaper reading public gathers chiefly that the American "melting pot" is a failure, and the differentiation between "superior" and "inferior" racial stocks immutable and unsurmountable. Eugenics, being still young as a field for research and offering delightful speculative possibilities, has attracted to itself both scientists and propagandists. The propagandists plead that families of better stock must procreate more to save the race from deterioration. They overlook, these protagonists of the "Nordic" school of anthropology, that the so-called "better people" have largely attained their eminence through economic emancipation. Subject them for a few generations to the disintegrating pressure under which nine-tenths of the world labors, and many of them will be scarce distinguishable in the submerged mass. This truth may be painful to those to whom eugenics is not science but cult or dogma. The fact remains that the path to a better human race lies through fewer and better children. The First American Birth Control Conference which is to be held in New York next month should do much to make clear the relationship between family limitation and a healthier and happier humanity. Over few subjects has the veil of obscurantism and prejudice been more closely drawn—many even of the eugenists, while tacitly approving the doctrine, shy a bit from endorsing it publicly.

IT requires only moderate knowledge or imagination to perceive the incalculable social effects of the introduction of modern medicine into China. Toward that goal disinterested men, among whom American medical missionaries have been conspicuous, have toiled valiantly. The recent dedication of the Peking Union Medical College and Hospital is a notable milestone. This college was made possible through the gifts of the Rockefeller Foundation. At the close of 1920 its medical school lands, buildings, and equipment were valued at $7,528,505. Men talk of the services Western Powers have rendered "backward nations" by introducing Western methods of healing or preventing disease. But here without preliminary imperial control is a finer service to public health than can be set to the credit of most colonial governments. Some of our radical and labor contemporaries, more used to the political and economic methods of some of Mr. Rockefeller's corporations than to the world-wide service rendered by the Foundation's campaign against disease, are inclined to advise the Chinese to look this gift horse in the mouth or at least to remember the toilers from whom all Mr. Rockefeller's benefactions have been wrung. We believe that disinterested purpose and real social vision lie behind this gift, though the suspicions it stirs call attention anew to the social problems enormous vested wealth creates even when there is an honest attempt to put some of it to the service of man.

CONDITIONS in Central and Eastern Europe are brought home to us by the untimely death of gifted men. From Russia comes the news of the passing of Alexander Blok, from Germany that of the death of Ludwig Thoma. Our sense of the quality of Blok's verse and prose is dim and gained at second hand. But it is clear enough that this poet was the voice, both strong and exquisite, not of one party or another, not even of the Russian Revolution in its temporal character, but of that hope and aspiration of mankind of which actual revolutions are the imperfect symbols. Of Ludwig Thoma's work we can speak from long and intimate acquaintance. A brilliant and for years incorruptible satirist, he was the leading spirit of the Munich *Simplicissimus* in its best days. He was the scourge of the hollow pretences of the imperial era, and finally in his notable plays and stories he transferred his satiric forces and insight from the particulars of a narrow social and political regime to the follies and errors of mankind. Plays like "Moral" and "The Medal" represent the best that modern comedy, outside of Shaw, has to offer; the stories of boyhood and peasant life are of extraordinary saneness, freshness, and spontaneity. The war or rather the peace obscured his political and social vision. But in his best years he was prolific and the mass of his memorable work is large.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Human Nature and Unemployment

MR. URBAIN LEDOUX calls himself an alarm clock to waken the slumbering conscience of the people; he might with equal aptness call himself a light to reveal men's hearts to themselves and to their fellows. At any rate his work for the unemployed in Boston and New York has singularly served to reveal not only the meaning and extent of unemployment, but the various reactions of men and women to the misery of their brethren. It did not, to be sure, take Mr. Ledoux to teach us that there was unemployment. The plain people knew it and thousands of them who had not yet experienced it lived in terror of its falling upon them. Radicals knew it, and used it more or less effectively to preach the need of a new order to replace a system which could not find food for the workers. Organized labor knew it, and had framed demands which it did not have the strength or perhaps the will to push aggressively. Settlement workers knew it; in New York they had a committee on the problem but the committee "had not felt there was much it could do." Organized charity knew it; Mr. Lawson Purdy of the New York Charity Organization Society was quite emphatic that the problem was already too big for the regular charity societies, which can only handle "the routine cases of families where the need of aid is due to some other cause than merely a lack of jobs." Employers and public officials knew it; but only a few of them planned intelligently to keep unemployment and the suffering from it within bounds. The Conference now in session in Washington is the fruit of that sort of interest. But none of these groups nor all of them together had succeeded in really firing the public imagination or arousing a sense of community responsibility. The unemployed suffered in silence; there is a natural tendency in man to believe that the disagreeable facts he refuses to admit even to himself do not exist; papers like the New York *Tribune* and *Times* deliberately minimize the volume of unemployment and its resultant suffering.

And then came Mr. Ledoux—"Mr. Zero." He had worked for the unemployed in New York last year, but his widespread notoriety rests upon his recent "slave market" or auction of the jobless on Boston Common. Three separate days he put unemployed men on the auction block stripped to the waist. So desperate was their need for food and clothing that they were willing to sell their services to the highest bidder. Not many men were thus sold but the public began to wake up. On Sunday, September 12, thousands of people gathered for another auction but there was none. Instead, that fine leader Harry Barnhart got the crowd to sing as Boston had not sung before. Mr. Ledoux felt that the work of the auction was done, and that "nothing so surely as music could break down the walls of selfishness and let the power of God in man be felt." Then Mr. Ledoux, believing that his immediate work in Boston was done, left the care of the unemployed there to others whose spirits he had aroused. He announced his intention of coming to New York. The New York newspapers had given publicity to the auctions; they had not reported the extraordinary musical demonstration which ended Mr. Ledoux's work. Against auctions of men there was naturally strong feeling. The Central Labor Council in New York requested the Mayor to forbid them. So when Mr. Ledoux reached the city he found a police force instructed to prevent any such attempt. Apparently their instructions went to extreme lengths, for they not only prevented any auction—an idea which Mr. Ledoux abandoned when he discovered the situation—but also the distribution of meal tickets or buns or even a meeting in Bryant Hall which he had rented. Three times in the afternoon and evening of September 19 they rode down and clubbed crowds that had gathered. The next day they clubbed homeless men who gathered to receive food distributed by generous women in Bryant Park. But on September 21 they changed their attitude and since then they have protected Mr. Ledoux in his relief work. He no longer desires to hold an auction, for as he himself says the police by their tactics have rung an alarm far louder than he can sound.

The significance of the episode lies to no small degree in the light that it sheds on human reaction to an urgent human problem. There is Urbain Ledoux himself, big, good-looking, an effective speaker, possessed of uncommon sympathy for his brothers—"the shorn lambs of labor," "the builders of the pyramids," to use two of his own phrases—dramatic talent, and capacity for leadership. Some of the newspapers the morning after the police had terrorized the crowd commented on the fortunate fact that so magnetic a leader as Mr. Ledoux disbelieved in violence. He does disbelieve in violence; his is "the direct action of the heart." He believes in spiritual forces, perhaps in a somewhat theosophical sense, and in sharing, not in charity. He will tell you that he is little concerned with "capital and labor" or indeed with any general social scheme. His own work is to feed the hungry and to save America not from any revolutionary menace but from "spiritual suffocation." His message is "lift up your hearts." He frequently carries a white umbrella on which are painted these words together with numerous red hearts. A visionary sentimentalist with a flair for publicity—so you might dismiss him, were it not for his earnestness and his ability to arouse the public and to get from the unemployed themselves the democratic cooperation which deals most effectively with the panhandler.

Then there is the official attitude. One hazards the guess that if Mayor Hylan and his advisers had understood what manner of man was Urbain Ledoux they would not have directed such drastic police action. As it was, pique at this intervention of an outsider, satisfaction with their own plan (the Mayor had appointed a committee and had obtained money for salaries), and that almost panic fear of protesting crowds which characterizes American officialdom since the war, swept them off their feet. They have, however, managed the subsequent situation cleverly. On the one hand they now enthusiastically protect Mr. Ledoux's food distribution and on the other the Mayor has issued a proclamation justifying the police and attacking his pet foes of the press. It was a ludicrous document but may appeal to the prejudice and fear of those to whom it is addressed. "The other night," it runs in part,

> "the police broke up a near-riot in Bryant Part that would have made the world think that New York was as lawless as an old-time mining camp if it had been allowed to spread. . . . Mr. Business Man, Mr. Merchant, Mr. Shopkeeper, when these hate-crazed newspaper publishers besmear New York and advertise it to the world as a paradise for criminals, they are making you pay the price of their political spite."

And the public? One reporter recorded the fact that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the hat was passed in Central Park, "hundreds of well dressed men and women alighting from touring cars, taxicabs, trolley cars," contributed—$5 in all. The *Times* concludes, editorially, that therefore, "Mr. Zero" and his aids "appear to be what is known on Broadway as a frost." Certainly, there is nothing to indicate any swelling tides of pity or indignation. Bishop Manning was too busy to see Mr. Ledoux and the unemployed when they called thinking they had an appointment. The appeal to the fears of "Mr. Business Man, Mr. Merchant, and Mr. Shopkeeper," will, we fear, prove more powerful than the exhortation to "lift up your hearts."

The attitude of organized labor deserves a special word. The leaders in the Central Council today are A. F. of L. labor politicians, most of them with strong Hearst-Murphy-Hylan affiliations. They will fight for their own unions but have no general social philosophy. It was natural that they should instinctively oppose the auction whose spirit they did not understand. "That's not American, that's slavery," one of the leaders said. "But is it American to ask the police to suppress it by force?" "Well, I wasn't there; the newspapers are liars anyway. Of course I don't believe in clubbing any one and if Ledoux was kept out of Bryant Hall that was wrong, but these auctions shouldn't be tolerated." And the speaker could not understand how exactly he duplicated the spirit and even the words of many a foe of labor when it is a labor demonstration which is broken up. It is fair to add that he had a program: public work by municipalities, states, and nation; immediate aid to the homeless through opening armories and distributing stores of army food; and a careful investigation of the causes of unemployment. But his organization has heretofore been ineffective and indifferent in pushing this or any other program.

Finally, there are the unemployed themselves, sleeping in parks and doorways and on docks, hungry and hopeless. Many of them are veterans once so loudly cheered as saviors of their country. So far they are very docile. They think in terms of what the newspapers say rather than of their own sufferings. Many of them have an almost pathetic trust in Mr. Ledoux. But whether this attitude will last is another matter. It is going fast in England.

In this story stupidity, prejudice, selfishness, fear, indifference loom large. But there is also the social vision of the radical, the practical program of the Association for Labor Legislation, the sheer love of men which Urbain Ledoux represents. And these constructive forces stand a better chance of winning because Mr. Ledoux has aroused the public to the existence of suffering it had tried to ignore. Such consciousness of human need is the necessary preliminary to any effective dealing with it.

Lord Curzon Sees Red

LORD CURZON had an attack of nerves the other day. Lord Curzon is the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, which is a large and puzzling task for the best of men, and if the Noble Lord got tired and peevish, who could be astonished? After all, his pet prodigies, the Greeks, had just "retired to stronger positions," the Albanian frontier was starting up trouble again, Washington was still distressingly vague about the agenda for the Armaments Conference, the Moplahs were on the warpath in India, and the Irish question was still very much unsettled. Why should a British Foreign Minister not have nerves?

This particular attack of nerves expressed itself in a note to the Soviet Government of Russia. It will be recalled that before the Russo-British Trade Treaty was signed, an anti-propaganda clause was drafted and, after emendations by both parties, inserted in the treaty. It required:

> That each party refrain from hostile actions or undertakings against the other and from conducting outside of its own borders any official propaganda, direct or indirect, against the institutions of the British Empire or the Russian Soviet Republic, respectively, and more particularly that the Russian Soviet Government refrain from any attempt, by military or diplomatic or any other form of action or propaganda, to encourage any of the peoples of Asia in any form of hostile action against British interests or the British Empire, especially in India and in the independent State of Afghanistan. The British Government gives a similar undertaking to the Russian Soviet Government in respect of the countries which formed part of the former Russian Empire and which have now become independent. . . . It is understood that the term "conducting any official propaganda" includes the giving by either party of assistance or encouragement to any propaganda conducted outside its own borders.

That was a strong clause, and very carefully worded. The British, for instance, at first objected to the phrase "independent state of Afghanistan"; they had come to regard Afghanistan as a sort of British protectorate. This Russo-British trade treaty was signed on March 16, 1921; on February 28 the Russians had signed a treaty with Afghanistan, which explicitly permitted them to open consulates at Herat, Meimen, Mazer-el-Sherif, Kandahar, and Gazn in Afghanistan. Lord Curzon's new note bitterly protests against these consulates as a violation of the no-propaganda clause. He says he knows that they are intended to be propaganda centers. He does not mention in his note a bit of entertaining diplomatic history which has not yet been published in the West. The British, it seems, have a rather elaborate but none too accurate spy system throughout the Near East. When the Soviet Government obtained buildings for its consulates, as specified in the Afghan treaty (which was prior to the British treaty), it put a caretaker in each, hung out the national flag of Soviet Russia, which happens to be the red flag, and left the buildings empty until trade should open up sufficiently to warrant sending a personnel to occupy them. The British spies saw the red flags and were very much alarmed; they notified Lord Curzon, and he thereupon sent a secret note to the Afghan Government telling it that the consulates must be suppressed. This was in early June; the Afghan Government, which, after several decades of British "friendship" had decided that it preferred the Bolsheviks, promptly referred the note to Moscow with a request for advice. Now such British interference was obviously an attempt to interfere with Russian interests in the independent state of Afghanistan, and Moscow naturally advised the Afghans politely to say No. Which they did. Lord Curzon suddenly protests publicly, not charging misuse of the consulates, but asserting that he has evidence that the Soviet Government regards them as "centers of *prospective* propaganda." A Foreign Minister who indicts threatening notes on the basis of such occult knowledge of prospective intentions shows a degree of nervousness unusual even in old school diplomats. The Noble Lord's nervousness about the Indian revolutionaries who went to Moscow in May is also exaggerated. As a matter of fact, they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came away bitterly disappointed, for they learned that Moscow was more interested in British trade than in Indian revolution and would not help them. But the supreme instance which should be cherished for all time as an example of Lord Curzon's sensitive nervous system, is his charge that the Soviet Government gave or lent the sum of 10,000 kronen to an alleged Indian anarchist who was moving from Vienna to Kabul, "for expenses connected with his wife and children." We have no information about this Dr. Hafiz, but we do know that according to current exchange rates 10,000 kronen amounts to about $9.00, and the British Foreign Minister who writes diplomatic notes about alleged gifts or loans of $9.00 seems to us to lack the Einsteinian sense of relativity.

Yet after all the way of the Foreign Minister is hard. Lord Curzon has to deny out of one corner of his mouth that Britain is helping the Greeks to fight the Turks, and to dictate, from the other corner, a statement that Russian aid to the Turks in their fight against Greece is unfriendly to Great Britain. The tangled web of British European diplomacy must be puzzling even to a veteran diplomat. Why, for instance, has Britain suddenly awakened to an impassioned defense of the 1913 frontiers of Albania, after defending Greek counter-claims for several years? How can she manage to pose as the defender of Islam in Mesopotamia, Arabia, and West India while feeding munitions to the Greeks in Asia Minor? After all, we don't blame Lord Curzon; we should think he would have a complete breakdown.

The Independent Merges

THE merger of the *Independent* and the *Weekly Review* will hardly come as a surprise to anyone in the profession. Knowledge that the *Independent* was on the market has been widespread; its decay has been obvious. But the passing of this journal out of the hands of the family which for so many years controlled it is none the less an occasion for regret. True, the announcement reads that Hamilton Holt will remain as consulting editor, but as the policy is to be controlled by the editors of the *Weekly Review* the break is there. For more than sixty years the Bowen-Holt family has conducted the *Independent*, which in the day of the religious journal was one of the great national molders of public opinion. Together with the *Observer* and Horace Greeley's *Weekly Tribune*, *Harper's Weekly*, and others it swayed the minds of God-fearing Americans in no small degree. Indeed, the journalistic decade from 1870 to 1880 may almost be called that of the religious weekly, antedating as it did the rise of the modern daily with its pictures, its "comics," and its supplements. But the once-all-powerful weekly editions of the dailies slowly died of inanition; the noble *Harper's Weekly* of Curtis dwindled to its fate; and the religious weekly more and more lost its hold as a narrow and intolerant and dogmatic Protestant church lost its rigid control over its members in the several sects. Whether it was because editors Greeley and Bowen left no successors as able as themselves, or whether these successors had no definite program to offer, or whether it was the changing taste of a fickle public, the *Independent*, the *Observer*, and the *Outlook* lost ground steadily, the last named despite its flare-up under the religious liberalism—in its day—of Lyman Abbott, and its sensational and sensationally short career as the mouthpiece of Theodore Roosevelt. Next a set of weekly and monthly journalists or muckrakers held the stage for their brief day. It is ominous, indeed, the brevity of each of these days—ominous for every editor and publisher who would hope to build on lasting foundations! Fashions change nowhere more rapidly than in our journalism.

But the *Independent*, to its credit be it said, has always kept its pages clean and its standards high. It yielded, of course, to the war-clamor and went with the tide, but under Mr. Holt's leadership it at least has had a definite program. For its editor-in-chief is an earnest and determined advocate of peace, filled with a passion for the League of Nations surpassed by that of no one else. To him it is as absorbing an issue as was slavery in its time and he prophesies that if the Harding Administration does not take us into the League the country will be organized against him, Congress carried next year, and a pro-League President elected in 1924. Fortunately, no merger and not even his complete retirement from journalism could keep Mr. Holt off the stump—his lecturing tours, indeed, may have been in part his undoing as an editor—and in this prospect we rejoice, completely as we disagree with him on the League, for we would always have the opposition to our own views set forth as ardently and as sincerely as Mr. Holt advocates what he believes.

We cannot, however, believe that a renaissance is in store for the *Independent*. Why is it that American conservatism must be wholly uninteresting and dull—deadly dull? The London *Spectator* under St. Loë Strachey is always good reading, full of information and able in its exposition of its point of view, while the London *Morning Post* presents with even greater skill and ability the cause of those who would turn back the hands of time and have the world stand still. Perhaps it is because American conservatism is still crude and instinctive, never having been forced as in England and Europe to develop its political philosophy and intellectual technique. Perhaps it is merely because the cause itself is so hopeless and goes so contrary to the nature of things and men that its presentation in this country lacks all life and charm, wit or distinction. There is, of course, nothing inspiring in forever holding back or in advancing only with the mincing steps of a schoolma'am of a hundred years ago. But there surely is room for a brilliant, forceful exposition of the conservative side, cast, let us say, in the somewhat heroic mood of nailing one's colors to the mast, or taking one's stand on the burning deck whence all but one's self has fled. Yet our Strachey has not yet come to pass and we are without even the dignity of London's daily Court Circular and organ of the aristocracy, though we have an aristocracy, or several, in the making.

Behind all lies the grave question whether any journal of opinion, liberal or conservative, weekly or monthly, can survive today. Most, if not all, are losing money and are eking out a difficult existence by the aid of friends and supporters, as the *Independent* did for years. One hopes, of course, that the inevitable renaissance of political thinking and mental activity which must follow upon the present period of political degradation, demoralization, and reaction will enable political and literary journals of all shades of opinion to live and flourish, provided they can furnish within themselves some reason for existence. They could and should be a tremendous check upon the daily journalism of America which daily serves its public less well and betrays the true America more insistently and persistently.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan's Absorption of Siberia

By NATHANIEL PEFFER

THE meaning of the vague and fragmentary news cablegrams from Siberia scattered through the back pages of the newspapers this last summer is simply this: The conquest by Japan of the great empire of Eastern Siberia is being rapidly forwarded; forwarded, indirectly but materially, by the Western Powers; forwarded most by America, which simultaneously is making of that process one of the issues through which we may drift toward conflict with Japan.

The bare facts as set forth by the press are that Vladivostok and its environs have been wrested from the control of the Far Eastern Republic by the forces of Kappel and Semionov and that a White government has been established; that the counter-revolutionaries are steadily pushing their control westward toward Chita and making a flank movement in Mongolia; that the Chita Government is imperiled, even the capture of Chita itself being reported. The Whites are nearer mastery over Siberia than at any time since Kolchak reigned at Omsk. The interpretation placed on these facts by the editorial writers, and presumably the public, is that another blow has been struck for liberty in Russia, that the anti-Bolsheviki have again emancipated Siberia from the dread Red tyranny, that Freedom sings once more on the steppes.

To those who neither think in labels nor write with a rubber stamp the facts are not so sweetly simple. These men —Semionov, Kappel, Ungern, and their ilk—are, to be sure, anti-bolshevik. They are the scum left behind by the Kolchak tide. They are anti-bolshevik, but only secondarily. Their prime, practical relation to Siberian events is not as enemies of bolshevism but as Japanese agents, made by Japan, paid by Japan, equipped by Japan, and operating for Japan. It is not a Russian political faction that rules Eastern Siberia. It is Japan.

I make these statements categorically, because it is superfluous to prove them. They can be found repeated in the files of the State Department and in the Military Intelligence Division at Washington, and in the files of the Foreign Offices and Military Intelligence Divisions of every important European capital. They are commonplaces to all residents of the Far East. They are openly discussed even in the Japanese press.

It is nearly two years since Kolchak came to his sorry end and the reactionaries, no longer buttressed by Allied gold, passed with him. The Allied and American armies withdrew. A government was formed at Chita which proclaimed itself non-bolshevik, non-soviet, and independent of Moscow. Whether it was or not is immaterial just now. In any case it was established, and brought order wherever it was able to go. But it has admittedly failed to reunite all Siberia. It has admittedly failed in the first test of a government, the ability to put down its internal enemies. In turn Semionov, Kalmikov, Kappel, Ungern, with their guerrilla bands of Cossacks and ex-brigands, have embarrassed and obstructed it. Without money, without visible sources of munitions and supplies, without permament bases, with only the scantiest communications they have managed to keep going, to maintain themselves against superior forces, to reappear again and again after reverses, and finally to win the upper hand, to conquer the Maritime Province, including the vital port of Vladivostok. How? And by whose help?

When the Allies and America withdrew their troops from Siberia, Japan did not. On the contrary, Japan seized Vladivostok and the Maritime Province, the northern half of Sakhalin, and vital links in the Chinese Eastern and Trans-Siberian railways. It has not been coincidence that where Semionovistas, Kappelistas, Ungernistas, and other tattered remnants of Czarism operated there were also officers of the Japanese General Staff. The frequent trips of the reactionary chieftains to Vladivostok, to Dairen, to Tsingtao, to Port Arthur—all Japanese-governed ports—and even to Japan itself have not been holiday jaunts. And their sudden coming into wealth following these trips has not been coincidence either.

Nor was it just a humanitarian impulse that prompted the Japanese to offer Semionov asylum for so many months last year and this year, at a time when he had been defeated by the Siberian army and his capture was imminent —the asylum from which he emerged suddenly when the coup was effected at Vladivostok. And what shall be said of those occasions when the Chita Government tried to send troops to crush the insurrectionary forces and the Japanese refused them passage over the railway; when an assembly of all the Siberian provinces was called to perfect a unified government representing all of Siberia and the Japanese refused to allow delegates from the western provinces to use the railway, vital links of which they controlled? Is it strange, then, this failure of the Siberian Far Eastern Republic to unite the whole of Siberia and subdue its internal enemies? Moreover, in the spring of 1920, when the Japanese seized Vladivostok on the ground that there was no government there capable of preserving order, that could guard against the inroads of the Bolsheviki who might menace Japan's shores, what was Japan's first step toward insuring the preservation of order? It disbanded virtually the whole local militia, the only existing machinery for guaranteeing peace. Was it purely a coincidence that the militia was the body loyal to the elements that were allied with the Chita Government and were pressing for Japan's complete evacuation?

Early this year it was a matter of tea-table gossip in all Far Eastern cities that a reactionary coup was impending in Siberia. In Peking the lobbies of the Hotel de Pekin and the Wagons-lits swarmed with notorious Russian reactionaries clanking spurs and drinking champagne, suddenly flush with prosperity. Among them were all the best-known lieutenants of Semionov and Kappel. And there were mysterious secret conferences long into the night and mysterious comings and goings from port to port, especially to and from those ports controlled by Japan. About the same time I happened to go to Tokio from Peking. In Tokio it was necessary for me to interview the national leaders, including Premier Hara and the principal cabinet ministers. I asked them when Japan intended to withdraw from Siberia. Not until there was in Siberia a government strong enough to preserve order, they said with unanimity. And they pointed out the danger of the impending outbreak.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How did the Japanese act in pursuance of their desire to preserve order, their avowed object in occupying Vladivostok? Just as everybody foresaw, there was a minor outbreak in Vladivostok in March. A number of Kappel adherents had seeped into the port. While they were waiting for reinforcements and the signal to act, their presence became known to the Vladivostok government authorities. The latter sent out police to arrest and disarm the Kappelistas. They found large numbers of them quartered in the homes of Japanese. But wherever they found them they disarmed them. The prospect of a coup being thus dashed, how did the Japanese act by way of demonstrating their neutrality in Russian internal affairs and their desire to see order preserved? They sent out their own gendarmerie, searched government military headquarters, forts, arsenals, and homes of officers, and seized all the arms they found. That is, all those they had not disarmed the year before they disarmed now. To perserve order in a country where a government was threatened with insurrection they disarmed the government!

The next step followed inevitably. The Japanese having made defenseless all those who might keep them out, the reactionaries headed by Kappel marched into Vladivostok, evicted the Government, and took control. In a few days they were joined by General Semionov, suddenly emerging from his Japanese asylum in Tsingtao. And did the Japanese disarm the Kappelistas then? They did not. The Kappelistas are still in Vladivostok; they have not been disarmed, and indeed are in control there now—side by side with the Japanese. Only those were to be disarmed who were for an independent Siberia. Naturally, a few days after the coup the Japanese papers all printed a long statement from one of Kappel's aides to the effect that all good Russians besought the Japanese Government not to withdraw its troops from Siberia but to remain there to cooperate in the work of reconstruction.

Small wonder, then, that the Japanese now say they will evacuate Siberia. Why not? Let the present Government of Vladivostok but consolidate its position and the Japanese can leave Eastern Siberia without a Japanese soldier or a Japanese gun and still govern it from Tokio as effectively as if it had been annexed. Everything the Japanese want in Siberia, concessions and the dictation of future political policies and economic development, they will have. And they will be spared the expense of an occupation and the embarrassment of explaining it away to their own people. Also they will be able to come to the Conference in Washington as one cleansed of conscience, saying: "See, have we not given up Siberia?" That is the true meaning of what comes heralded to readers of the American press as "the overthrow of the Bolsheviki in Siberia."

Now I say these things with no animus toward Japan and not in any harsh spirit of criticism. I do not believe Japan is particularly to be blamed. In a politically cynical world where nations take all they can, I do not see why Japan for mere righteousness should turn its face against opportunity's offer of an empire. No nation would. The guilt rests, as I said before, more on the Western Powers, most of all on America. For we made the opportunity, made it out of our hallucinations concerning bolshevism. The events now occurring in the Far East are but the logical and inevitable result of our fatuous and inept policy as displayed there. The result was foredoomed from the beginning.

It was foredoomed by that first major insanity, the intervention in Siberia. Every dictate of reason was against intervention. Throughout the war the Japanese imperialists had shown their intention of taking advantage of every possible opening while the Western Powers were too involved in the war to watch or protest. They had shown it in the Twenty-one Demands, in their occupation of Shantung, and in their political and economic penetration of Peking. The most elementary principle of diplomacy demanded that the status quo be left undisturbed; that no unnecessary openings be given. Instead, with the warning before us of the Twenty-one Demands, Shantung, and the penetration of Peking, we cut the biggest opening of all. We led the Japanese into Siberia.

Then after the Kolchak fiasco and the withdrawal of Allied and American troops and Japan's refusal to withdraw, the most elementary principle of diplomacy demanded that we foster any nucleus of a government that might restore peace in Siberia and thus leave the Japanese no pretext for remaining. Still seeing Red ghosts, we did nothing of the kind. The American press and the American State Department gibbered in imbecile terror, part genuine as the result of ignorance and part simulated as the result of interest, about Red tides of bolshevism sweeping toward the Pacific and the noble Japanese army standing heroically at the dikes of civilization. American residents of China and Japan, American military attachés, American intelligence officers, American correspondents, American consular officers even, cried out in wearisome iteration that there was no bolshevism in Siberia, that the presence of alien troops was merely driving Siberia into the arms of Moscow, that intervention was giving the Siberians no alternative but that of choosing either their own people, even if Bolsheviki, or alien conquerors, but all these voices remained unheeded. During all this time the Japanese, tongue in cheek, gravely confirmed America's worst fears.

A year ago only, when the special assembly of the Far Eastern Republic was convened at Chita and a bid was made for foreign recognition, when the whole future of Siberia was possible of recasting, America did not compromise itself by heeding the call, did not thus violate its conceived faithfulness to civilization's trust. Not an American diplomatic agent, official or unofficial, not an American attaché, not an American correspondent was within two thousand miles of the scene, while the Japanese had full diplomatic, military, and commercial missions present throughout. The Far Eastern Republic implored the American Government to send investigators to see for themselves, implored American business men to accept its trade, implored American capitalists to accept its concessions; but America raised the hand of stern righteousness against the barbarian's wily temptings. The Japanese, on the other hand, poured hundreds of commercial agents into the country, and on occasional trips across Manchuria and Korea, I myself have shared compartments on the railway with British and French business men back from Siberia with order books bursting with contracts.

So throughout we frustrated every effort to realize the sole possibility of bringing about the only condition that would give the world unquestioned right to insist on Japan's withdrawal and leave Japan no legitimate ground for remaining—we, I say, meaning Americans, because Americans more than any other people were subject to bolshevik hallucinations. We not only refused to recognize the Far Eastern Republic, we not only refused to encourage the establishment of a government, but we actually defeated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any attempt to establish one. We made stability in Siberia impossible. We did exactly what the Japanese militarists and imperialists wanted us to do. While the Japanese people clamored for the withdrawal of the Siberian expedition and the Japanese militarists whose every instinct is anti-American worked feverishly to create pretexts for remaining, *we Americans gave our support to the militarists.* We worked for them as effectively as Semionov or Kappel or Ungern or any of their other paid agents. We worked along the same lines. We stratified instability, paralyzed the forces for order, underwrote chaos. We opened the door for Japanese aggression. And now we have brought about this, the inevitable conclusion: we have overthrown the Government in Eastern Siberia and enthroned Japan. We have furthered the process of making over to Japan, for purposes of exploitation, half an empire, an Eldorado.

We have done more than that. We have needlessly and artificially created yet another issue with Japan. For now that we have done what we have, we begin to perceive its consequences. The same press that applauded when Japan began to execute its design, now that the design has been executed, voices its suspicion of Japanese intentions. The same Government that connived at the accomplishment of Japan's purposes, now calls Far Eastern conferences to discuss the results. The issue, however artificially created, will be pressed. We shall come to see that while in the last few years we have tried to obstruct every imperialistic ambition of Japan we have actually helped realize one of its major ambitions. Now we shall say to Japan, with much justice, that its dominance over Siberia is in derogation of international rights in the Pacific. But nations seldom abandon territory or special positions that they have gained at some sacrifice. Thus the issue will be sharpened and yet more sharpened, and added unto the numerous other issues being sharpened—also needlessly, many of them—until the world confronts the grave danger of recourse to what nations still believe is a solution of their differences.

Contributors to This Issue

NATHANIEL PEFFER is an American journalist who has just returned from a five years' sojourn in the Far East.

J. P. WARBASSE is the President of the Co-operative League of America, the Editor of *Co-operation*, and one of the two delegates from the United States to the Tenth International Co-operative Congress.

LINCOLN COLCORD is well known as a writer of articles and short stories. He has been a frequent contributor to *The Nation.*

ARTHUR WARNER, associate editor of *The Nation*, is in West Virginia making a firsthand study of the industrial conflict in the coal fields.

GILBERT SELDES is the managing editor of *The Dial.* He has been an associate editor of *Collier's*, American correspondent for the *Echo de Paris* and editorial writer for the Philadelphia *Evening Ledger.*

ALFRED B. KUTTNER is Chairman of the Critique Committee of the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures. He was formerly dramatic critic of the *International Magazine.*

Why Lloyd George Negotiates with De Valera

By LINCOLN COLCORD

MANY conscientious readers of the news from Ireland are nonplussed at the way recent events there have hung fire. In document after document, President De Valera has defied the British Government, and has maintained his stand unyieldingly for full liberty, the consent of the governed, and independence for Ireland. In reply after reply, Mr. Lloyd George has held to his point of an Ireland within the Empire, but with studied urbanity has left the door open for further negotiations. The passage of words at times has seemed to take on the aspect of open bantering. But the crisis is acute, the words of the Irish President, at least, have been terribly sincere, and it is not the habit of Downing Street to banter concerning the welfare of the Empire. Everyone has sensed that more lay behind the scenes than was being voiced by either party to the negotiations. The statements themselves as well as the apparent dearth of action, have not been self-explanatory; they have not accounted, either for Ireland's confident defiance, or for the long-suffering patience of Great Britain.

This mystery, however, largely is the result of our faith in politics and our trust in the news. Unconsciously, in our thinking on this issue, we have credited politics with a real desire to solve the difficulty, and have failed to apply logic to the news which has been given us, in an attempt to deduce the news which has not been given us. Thus we have been taken in by a picture which is an illusion.

Let us start a candid analysis of the Irish situation with the fact—a fact so quickly forgotten!—that it was the British Government, not the Irish Republic, which sought the present truce and instituted the present parley. What could have been the motive for this act? Public opinion, in Great Britain and in the world at large, had been aligned despite all opposition in support of the Government's policy of coercion in Ireland. Parliament sustained the policy by an overwhelming majority, a majority sufficient at times to stop question or discussion; in spite of distressing revelations of the work in Ireland, the Government had weathered the storm, Mr. Lloyd George was not in danger, and each successive statement by Sir Hamar Greenwood was cheered to the echo in the House. The liberal British press was protesting, but nothing serious had come or need be expected to come of it. The overseas press long ago had taken its cue, and was presenting only the Government's side of the Irish situation. Even British Labor, erstwhile Moses who was to lead us to a new world, was shockingly silent in respect of Ireland.

In short, within the political sphere the Government had achieved complete liberty of action, and its policy of coercion no longer was questioned in any important quarter. So complete was support of this policy, indeed, that suddenly to turn about to negotiate with the Irish murderers of a week ago, to dignify Sinn Fein by accrediting to it a measure of sovereignty for Ireland, was an extremely dangerous course, and, from the political viewpoint, seemed extremely unwise, in the sense that it deliberately threw overboard a cargo of carefully prepared ammunition. The protest from conservative England has been stronger than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we in America know; for the *Morning Post* speaks for the majority of the present Parliament. On every count, the decision to seek negotiations with the Irish Republican Government marked a great effort on the part of Downing Street, an effort greater than would have been required to continue the policy of coercion.

The steps by which policy had to be changed—the signing of a truce with the Irish military establishment, thus destroying the claim that there was no Irish military establishment; the granting of amnesty to the members of the Dail Eireann; the reception of President de Valera and his cabinet in London, where the week before they had been excoriated as a handful of extremists who represented nothing but themselves; and the tacit admission that a Government, deriving sovereignty from the Irish people, existed and had to be reckoned with—all this, according to the political formula, was a serious loss of face, and disclosed the extent of the effort which the British Government had undertaken.

For such a decision there could be only two explanations. First, the British Government might have succumbed to an attack of true statesmanship; Mr. Lloyd George might have suffered a spiritual reformation; the effort might have been imbued with a full sincerity of purpose and realization of error, in an attempt to retrieve the honor of Great Britain, to establish justice, to substitute right for wrong. Or, second, the British Government might have been acting under the compulsion of economic necessity.

The first explanation is, of course, part of that illusion of faith by means of which politics continues to function on the body of the people. The answer to it is that the British terms to Ireland do not constitute a true settlement, and that force constantly is held in active reserve as the only alternative. However much we might wish to believe it, this explanation is not practical. We must be permitted to have learned something in the past few years.

Economic necessity, however, fully covers the case and satisfies the unknown factors of the equation. Coercion in Ireland was beginning to be too expensive an interprise for the British to carry on. We have no direct news of Great Britain's financial condition, that is, as the Government views it; but from events and statistics the inference is plain. Within six months, the Mesopotamian enterprise has been abandoned, and the trade pact with Soviet Russia has been signed. There are no more troops for intervention in Russia; there are no more troops to support French policy on the Continent. Affairs in India are alarming, and that chiefly on the economic side. Latterly, the swing of British policy toward a better understanding with Germany over the question of reparations has been marked; a swing, it should be noted, in opposition to the military policy of France.

All these are evidences of drastic British curtailment; and curtailment means a difficult decision and a critical effort, for it always is unpopular. British trade figures tell a serious story; the export trade for the past year was half of what it was the year before. British shipping never has seen such a period of depression. The unemployment figures are formidable, in view of the economic background against which they stand. Over and above these considerations, we have the fact of British enthusiasm for disarmament, a fact which may be held suspicious as a political manifestation, but which finds a simple explanation in economic terms.

Unquestionably, the British financial problem is a pressing one; and the Irish negotiations are but part of a general policy of retrenchment in the economic sphere. When we fit this explanation to the picture, the illusion is dissipated. Until her finances become more stable, Great Britain has no intention of breaking down the negotiations and resuming military operations in Ireland, no matter what the Republican Government says. Her decision is based on economic reasons, and remains relatively unaffected by the political formula. She looks upon the truce, not as an opportunity to settle the issue on a basis of principle and right, but rather as an opportunity to recuperate for a settlement along the lines of her own policy. The Irish, of course, are aware of all this, and for the moment feel doubly free to maintain the integrity of their principles, knowing that, if they speak as gentlemen and do not make the situation impossible, the truce and the negotiations may go on indefinitely. But how long, and what will be the tactics on either side, are the questions which constitute the real interest, the dramatic appeal, of the present conference.

Great Britain's tactics, obviously, are to make the most of her liberalism and generosity, and through the influence of public opinion, both at home and abroad, to bring the Irish Republican Government to an acceptance of her offers. Mr. Lloyd George's moral position ostensibly is a strong one, and he has made all possible capital of the change of policy. He has convinced the headline-reading majority everywhere of the fairness of his proposals, and has put into the mouth of this majority the assertion that if the Sinn Fein leaders refuse such terms, it will be only a final demonstration of Irish recalcitrance. The outrightness of the Irish Government's adherence to principle naturally confirms this view with the great body of thoughtless opinion. Few people, reading President de Valera's admirable statements of basic principle, have cared to recognize their unanswerableness. A politically minded world calls for a compromise.

This very outrightness of adherence to principle, however, is the only course which Ireland safely can adopt under the circumstances. Her leaders are honest enough to bow to the fatality of righteousness. The British offer does not fill the bill; it is not what the Irish people want. If adopted, it would not constitute a permanent settlement. Ireland's task is to continue the negotiations, to prolong the truce, and in the interval to convince world opinion of the justice of her demand for complete liberty of action. In this campaign, she cannot allow herself to deviate a hair's breadth from rectitude.

The success of these tactics, unfortunately, presupposes a world opinion thoughtful, sincere and well-informed. Lacking such a devoutly-to-be-wished consummation, the political formula itself is likely to be ineffective, and the issue actually will be determined in the economic sphere, wholly aside from principle or argument. Great Britain is not ready to give up her hold on Ireland. Whether through a compromise settlement, or through a resumption of military operations as a result of Irish refusal to accept the British terms, coercion in Ireland probably will recommence the moment the British exchequer sees its way to footing the bills. Is it possible that the Washington Conference, with all its excellent possibilities, is looked upon by the British Government primarily as an opportunity to arrive at a naval understanding with the United States and fund the debt in order that her imperialism be no longer handicapped by poverty?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Tenth International Cooperative Congress

By J. P. WARBASSE

"THIS was the only thing during the trying years of the war that gave me courage and hope that the spirit of internationalism was not dead." Thus spoke Senator Lorenz of the Czecho-Slovak Parliament and delegate to the Tenth International Cooperative Congress. He was traveling from Prague toward Basel, and as he spoke, he held up a copy of the Bulletin of the International Cooperative Alliance. Lorenz was not alone in this feeling; it was experienced in twenty-four other countries. Each month without interruption this magazine of the international cooperative movement, printed in its three different editions, English, French, and German, had gone forth, its articles by writers of almost every nation breathing the spirit of comradeship in a great cause when everything else that represented internationalism had gone down in the welter of war.

The Ninth International Cooperative Congress was held in Glasgow in 1913; the tenth was to have been held in Basel, Switzerland, in 1915. But the world was still dominated by an economic system which requires war-making governments; and accordingly the cooperators had to defer their meeting. However, the last week in August, 1921, saw over 1,200 duly elected delegates from the cooperative movement of twenty-five countries come together at Basel. Men whose governments would have made them enemies looked into one another's faces and shook hands, tacitly agreeing "whom our cooperative movement hath united let no government put asunder." In one closely contested issue, which split the congress in twain, the eighty-four German delegates and the forty-eight French delegates voted together as a single block. Here at Basel in this Congress was the closest approach to an effective league of peoples the world has yet seen. The business of these delegates was to promote true internationalism, because the cooperative movement by substituting production and distribution for *use* for the present profit-motive in industry eliminates the chief cause of war. Their business was further to formulate and standardize the principles upon which such an organization of society must rest.

The delegates who were elected to this congress by the cooperative societies of all the continents of the world represented about 30,000,000 families of 125,000,000 people. Some came from Denmark, Finland, and Switzerland, in which more than half of the population are embraced in the movement; some from countries in which one-third of the population is included in the movement, such as Great Britain, Germany, Hungary, and Austria; and some from countries in which the movement is backward and struggling against great difficulties, such as the United States, Japan, and Argentina. Many delegates represented cooperative societies which are the biggest distributive organizations, retail and wholesale, or the largest manufacturing businesses in their respective countries. These facts are significant when one realizes that these great enterprises are organized, financed, owned, controlled, and administered by the people who consume their products. It is also significant that this democratization of economic power has been developed most highly in industrial countries such as England, Scotland, Denmark, Switzerland, and Germany.

While many countries have a national wholesale society, one of the tasks of the Congress was the promotion of an international wholesale. An international cooperative trading organization is to be developed, which will carry on the exchange of raw materials and manufactured articles among the various national cooperative bodies.

The resolutions presented by Professor Charles Gide, of France, on "International Right According to the Spirit of Cooperation" declared that "the progressive general adoption of the cooperative method in the economic world will gradually eliminate the essential causes of war." Anders Oerne, of Sweden, presented a report, "The Policy of International Cooperation," which formulated the cooperators' position, in part as follows:

> Modern cooperation arose as a protest against the injurious effects produced by the existing profit-system. At its very inception it involved a negation of the entire principle on which the economic system of the time was founded, namely, free competition and the division of the community into a dominating group of producers and an opposed group of consumers. Cooperation substitutes for the interest in profits, as the sole inducement to carry on economic activities, the interest in commodities as a means of satisfying human needs.

G. Lévy of France offered a plan and resolutions for the organization of an international bank, which were carried unanimously. The resolutions provide for a conference of national cooperative banks to carry out the program. This proposal is now being acted upon.

Some of the vicious effects of the Versailles Treaty were seen in the need for the resolution offered by V. Pittoni, of Italy, on behalf of the Italian, Austrian, and Czecho-Slovak delegations, protesting against the violation of cooperative societies and other working-class organizations by the present Hungarian Government. The debate developed that the Hungarian Government carries on a "white terror" against anything that interferes with big profiteering business, that it suspended committees, nominated government officials to control cooperative societies, used violence to break up their ordinary business meetings, and prevented the cooperative societies from sending delegates to the congress. Karl Renner, formerly Austrian prime minister, substantiated the report and spoke against a proposal to defer action upon the ground that unless something were done soon the Hungarian Government might destroy the whole cooperative movement of that country. Similar resolutions were passed concerning the persecution of the Ukrainian cooperative societies by the Polish military forces in Ukrainian Galicia, and on the destruction of cooperative stores in Italy by "bands in the pay of the capitalists with the connivance of the police."

The seating of the Russian delegates involved the whole principle of cooperative societies controlled by governments. It was stated that the great Russian movement had been taken over by the Soviet Government, but that the Government, finding itself unable to handle the situation was gradually restoring a certain measure of liberty to the societies. Delegates asserted that the movement was still so subject to political control that no delegates from Russia could be regarded as the free choice of a free cooperative movement. On the other hand, it was felt unjust to disfranchise the whole Russian movement because it had been made the vic-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tim of circumstances over which it had no control; therefore two delegates were accepted who were known to have been cooperators before the Government undertook the control of the cooperatives.

The influence of the movement in Switzerland may be judged from the character of the long and eloquent address of welcome to the delegates by the President of the Swiss Republic. "We must have a system of cooperation," he said, "which would make profit-for-all the rule instead of profit-for-the-individual." He spoke of "your great movement," acknowledged the debt which the Swiss people owed to cooperation, and advocated teaching its principles and practice in the public schools. He also made one of the dedicatory addresses at the opening of the cooperative village of Freidorf, in Basel, where 180 houses have recently been erected by the Freidorf Cooperative Society.

As I visited the cooperative societies in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, and Switzerland before the Congress, again conferred with their representatives at Basel, and lectured to the students at the International Cooperative School, it was borne upon me that the movement has reached such a size and development in Europe that it is the most substantial institution that the people have yet created—more substantial than the old economic system which is breaking down, more substantial than the present governments, many of which are none too firmly established. The Basel society is a fair sample of what one finds in thousands of European cities. Its products are the best; its stores are clean and neat; the cooperative creamery which supplies more than half of the people of the city with milk, for beauty and up-to-dateness, surpasses private enterprises; its bakeries, warehouses, and factories present the marks of success. When one examines the institutions of the wholesale societies—factories, meat-packing establishments, offices, and warehouses—one is impressed with their enduring character. Cooperation in Europe seems sound and permanent and adapted still to further expansion.

On the last night of the Congress the local Basel society held a festal meeting. Over 6,000 attended. It was a great demonstration of the interest of the people. The speakers were Karl Renner of Austria, E. Poisson of France, H. Lorenz of Germany, and myself. Here one stood face to face with thousands of people who understood the fundamentals of cooperation. It is bred in the Swiss. They get it at school and at work, and they easily and naturally become members of the cooperative society. In America we have a long way to go before we catch this spirit that shall animate us to solve our own problems in our own societies.

The effect of this congress will be far reaching. While the real work of cooperation must be done "back home" among the people in their local societies, the congress teaches the humblest member that his society is a part of a great world movement which is made up of just such people as himself in all lands, and that he is represented in it and through it. The kinship of humanity was well expressed in this congress. There was a feeling that in all of the bungling and chaos of political action, here at least is a movement wholly within the economic field that is capable of solving the problems that defy diplomats. Perhaps it was a presage of the future when the Austrian Cooperative Union at its last national congress offered to take over the function of the Austrian Government and stand in the place of the state.

West Virginia—Industrialism Gone Mad

By ARTHUR WARNER

THERE is just one point at issue in the whole sequence of violence and homicide that has led West Virginia into a state of virtual, although unacknowledged, civil war. It is the right to belong to a labor union as represented by the United Mine Workers of America. In the strife-torn territory—the southwestern counties of Mercer, McDowell, Logan, and Mingo—there are no demands for workers' control, for higher wages or shorter hours. There is not even any immediate question of recognition of the union or collective bargaining.

It is important not to lose sight of this elementary fact in the detail likely to be uncovered in the promised investigation of the West Virginia situation by the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate. Such an inquiry was begun in the summer but adjourned after a few days. Subsequently Senator Kenyon of Iowa and Senator Shortridge of California spent three days—September 18 to 20, inclusive—in the coal fields of Mingo and Logan counties and a fourth in talking with State officials in Charleston. On this trip no formal hearings were held nor was any testimony taken under oath. The announced purpose was to get a picture of the country and to lay the base for a searching inquiry later on. It is to be hoped that the suggestion that this inquiry take place at Huntington, a convenient point for the purpose, will be acted upon.

Whatever one may think of it economically or ethically, the coal operators of the southwest section of West Virginia are within their legal rights in trying to keep out unionism provided they do not resort to illegal methods to do it. But even in the hurried survey of Senators Kenyon and Shortridge, there was abundant evidence within their reach, and that of the nine press correspondents who accompanied them, of illegality of extraordinary boldness and extent. There are four main ways in which the operators are fighting unionization: by court injunction, by martial law, by a suzerainty of the county governments, and by hired gunmen. The first two methods are not illegal but are so one-sided and so oppressive toward the miners as to be subversive of the public welfare. The last two methods have led to a regime of illegality, brutality, and killing almost unbelievable in a supposedly civilized and law-governed State. Small wonder that the miners and their sympathizers, filled with a sense of injustice, oppression, and unrest, have retaliated in kind. And now, to cap the climax, a policy has been adopted of meeting force with more force; of increasing the number of armed men in an already too much armed and too greatly inflamed region; of restoring order, harmony, and peace by shoving a gun muzzle against the stomach of any one who indicates a contrary sentiment. At this writing, in addition to scores of individual gun toters in the disturbed areas, there are five recognized bodies of men enforcing their authority at the point of firearms: Federal troops, State militia, State police or constabulary, deputy sheriffs, and mine guards. Is it odd that shootings and battles should come to be regarded as almost normal?

To return to the four chief methods with which the coal operators are fighting the introduction of unionism, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first—court injunctions—has been successfully invoked in Mercer and McDowell counties in consequence of the "yellow dog" contracts described by Winthrop D. Lane in his pamphlet, "Civil War in West Virginia." These contracts bind miners not to belong to a labor union during their employment nor to "aid, encourage, or approve" the formation of such a body. On the basis of these agreements the highest court of the State has granted an injunction forbidding representatives of the United Mine Workers even to appeal to miners in Mercer and McDowell counties to join the organization.

In Mingo County an attempt at unionization was made somewhat over a year ago. It was met by the discharge of all union men and their summary eviction from company-owned houses. Many of them and their families are still living in tent colonies, supported by the United Mine Workers. Feeling is naturally bitter, and after a year of violence on both sides martial law was declared and is still in effect in Mingo County. Without attempting to discuss the details here, it is sufficient to point out that through its power to restrict public assembly martial law provides the means for suppressing union activities.

Now as to suzerainty over county governments exercised by the coal companies and the use of hired gunmen. The two go hand in hand. The entire State of West Virginia has an unenviable reputation for control by the coal operators, but in the actual producing fields local government is at their mercy. Through their mines, their company-owned stores and dwelling houses, their subsidized preachers and teachers, the operators control the livelihood and the lives of virtually the whole population. Hence, politically, the region is their pocket borough. The operators admit and defend the practice of preserving order through deputy sheriffs, paid partially or entirely out of company funds. In addition to these privately-owned public officials, there are also mine guards, armed and exercising police functions without a vestige of authority. Among both these latter classes there are many men whose methods and records justify one in calling them thugs and gunmen. "Private detectives" of the Baldwin-Felts agency are used largely in Mercer, McDowell, and Mingo counties. They are not employed in Logan County. There Sheriff Don Chafin and his company-subsidized deputies rule supreme. When Senators Kenyon and Shortridge went into Logan County they sent word ahead that they especially wanted to see Chafin, but upon arrival he was not on hand and was reported to be away resting after his strenuous efforts in defending the county against invasion by the marching miners a few weeks previous. His efforts then were indeed strenuous according to two affidavits filed with the Senatorial committee. Floyd D. Greggs, sworn before a notary public at Montgomery, West Virginia, on September 6, declares that he arrived in Logan on August 24 looking for work. Two minutes later he was arrested by a deputy sheriff and taken to the jail. Greggs then states:

> On August 29th about 12:30 a. m. I was taken from jail by three armed deputies and taken to the County Court House and into the presence of Don Chafin, sheriff of Logan County, who pinned a white band around my left arm, and was then conducted by the aforesaid Don Chafin into another room of the Court House which was filled with arms and ammunition and told to select a Winchester rifle and go to the front to fight.
>
> I told him that I carried a rifle for eighteen months in the Fifth Regiment, United States Marines, and that I did not intend to go out there and fight against a working man as I was a working man myself. He then drawed a .45 calibre revolver and putting the muzzle in my face told me that I would either fight or die. I told him to shoot as I was not going to fight. He then ordered me sent back to jail.
>
> On Thursday, September 1st, about 7 p. m., I saw a union bricklayer from Huntington, W. Va., shot down in cold blood murder in the corridor of the jail, not three feet from my cell. Two shots were fired. . . . Two deputies then taken the man that was shot by the feet and dragged him from the jail and across the C. and O. R. R. tracks toward the river.

Greggs concludes by saying that on the night of September 2 he was released by Don Chafin personally, who gave him fifteen minutes to get out of town and until daylight to get out of the county "or get my head blown off." The affidavit of Greggs is corroborated by one made by Clomar Stanfield, another inmate of the jail at the time, who adds the details that the murdered man was a union bricklayer from Huntington and that he was shot because he refused to fight against the marching miners. Both affidavits name the man who did the shooting, but owing to the gravity of the charge and the absence of an indictment I omit it.

The southwest corner of West Virginia constitutes only one of several frontiers of unrestricted and rampant American industrialism, differing chiefly in environment and degree. To me the right to unionize is as sacred as any of those mentioned in the Declaration of Independence—is indeed a necessary corollary of them. I can see no industrial peace, therefore, until it—and more—is obtained. In the present temper of the operators the outlook for this is gloomy unless it is won by the miners against all obstacles. The turmoil is primarily a State question, but the State seems to be in no frame of mind to deal with it adequately. The most immediate and obvious need is to get rid of martial law on one hand and gunmen rule on the other, replacing both by an adequate civil administration. A State constabulary or police force is repugnant to American sentiment but it is probably a necessary evil in West Virginia. A mining community is not a normal one. Instead of consisting of a variety of business and professional interests, all finding a common denominator in the desire for protection of life and property, it is composed almost exclusively of the employers and employed in a single industry, each distrustful of the other. A local police force is therefore almost inevitably a pawn in the hands of one side or the other. West Virginia has started to develop a State police, but its character is not above suspicion and in any event time will be needed to win for it the confidence of the miners. They do not easily distinguish between kinds of authority, and the mine guards have so long abused them in illegal ways that even an honest and impartial police force would win their confidence slowly.

Meanwhile what can the Federal Government do? Senators Kenyon and Shortridge pressed those with whom they talked for remedies, but got few suggestions. Senator Kenyon in particular expressed the belief that there were far too many firearms carried in West Virginia, and a Federal restrictive law may be one of the recommendations that will follow the pending inquiry. But without a great change in conditions, such legislation would only add to the oppression of the miners by increasing the power in the hands of their oppressors. Federal regulation of coal mines, to a point at least as far as that reached with the railroads, is one of the possibilities of the future. The operators would do well to bend a little in their stubbornness and obscurantism to contemplate such an eventuality.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The House of Esau

By GILBERT SELDES

HISTORY would be a more decent affair if we admitted at once that the names we give to events are dictated purely by our own interest and prejudice. It is because we are accustomed to being human that we talk about progress and evolution and because we like to be American that we think of 1776 as the date of our independence. If we preferred to be British or monkeys we should have other names for these things; if a second Civil War had resulted in a Southern Confederacy we should consider Appomattox as a beginning and not as an end. We talk of the purity of Latin or the simplicity of an amoeba because in these cases our passions are not seriously involved and we can understand what is meant by a point of view. In the more urgent matters events dictate names and ideas, and only a few free spirits are, like Remy de Gourmont, courageous enough to dissociate the ideas from the events and the prejudices which give them to us.

It requires only a moderately critical mind to wonder whether the great "beginnings" of our time aren't the ends of things more precious. The Great Peace (a name dictated either by irony or by an intense desire not to be altogether sold-in this world) put an end to the oldest monarchy and to the most tenacious federal experiment on the Continent; it also ended two great dispersions: that of the Jews and that of the Poles. I need not describe the difference between the two and, since I have never been a Pole and am without the royalist, Catholic, aristocratic background, I cannot say what temptations assailed the Polish spirit when nationalism was offered. The Jewish case is extraordinarily simple.

When the Jew found himself in possession of a national state he accepted it because for many centuries nations had been a decisive feature of his life and a thousand compelling reasons and constraints were on him to accept. They began with such persecutions as nations had aforetime visited upon him and ended, as well they might, with the pressure of Britain's need for another outpost of influence in the Near East. The Heads of the House of Israel forgot one thing: they were putting an end to the greatest, the unhappiest, and potentially the most magnificent experiment in internationalism which the world has ever witnessed. They forgot that one among them had also, long ago, sold his birthright. When they accepted their fate as a nation they put themselves openly in opposition to their destiny as a people.

I know that "destiny as a people" can easily be twisted about in any argument on nationalism. I do not, at any rate, mean "manifest destiny." I mean that the Jew has a definite function in our world, a function for which he is superbly fitted by his experience and which no one else can fulfil: *to be international,* to exist without a national state and yet to exist; to break down the nationalist system with all its corruptions solely by showing that it is unnecessary. Just as I should say that it is the destiny of the British people to go to sea in ships without being held as a protagonist of the two-Power naval standard; or that it is the destiny of the Bedouins not to go to sea without being necessarily opposed to trade with desert hinterlands.

That negative thing—to be not a nation—suffices the Jew because he can never lose his identity. He is distinguished by his race and to a lesser degree within his race by his religion. He has unity. For 1900 years that unity has been expressed without the cohesion of a state and over that unity has passed a diversity of allegiance which could never be questioned because it was complete—he had no state and was faithful to any state which adopted or persecuted him warmly enough. The underlying thing was never touched—no more than the fact that I am male, white, and unmarried is affected when I swear to uphold the Constitution. There is a unity between men which women cannot share and a solidarity among whites which may well be a necessary part of their lives. But these things do not make them the enemies of women nor, in civilized countries, the persecutors of browns or blacks. And being a Jew—*mihi crede experto*—is just like that. That is why the Jew is never merely a cosmopolite and why the Negro is not international; because the one has his unity and the other, with no other identity so far than that of color, is insufficiently grounded in himself to resist the inroads of cosmopolitanism.

The Jew as an international being is the result of accidents and disasters. His experience is ample excuse for giving it up and I hasten to say that I wouldn't for anything restore the Inquisition in order to give the world another martyred example of extra-national life. But the Jew has given up the experiment just at the moment when his bitterest enemies were powerless to harm him, just when he could have redeemed the centuries of persecution, and just when he might, by the simple gesture of refusal, have taken the place he has always claimed—leading humanity, the Chosen People.

I cannot believe that the Jews were chosen by God to perpetuate in ignominious conditions the colossal and bloody errors of a hundred other national states. The Jews have always been proud of their sufferings—offensively to me because so few of them realized how great a thing they were suffering for. Their internationalism has been unconscious and all the more effective for that. And it is queer now to have American Jews reject the Jewish state in favor of America. That is not a philosophical reason nor even a particularly patriotic one. The sole ground for rejecting the Jewish state is internationalism, nothing else. Even if no new international order were within our reach (it is actually around the corner) it would be enough to reject a national state merely as a blow to the system which stands definitely against our white (or European or Christian) civilization. To accept it at a moment when one great gesture might have questioned the whole foundation of nationalism was simply betrayal; a minor thing for Poland, but for the Jew the betrayal of the one thing, since the idea of monotheism, which Israel has given the world.

I have been told, chiefly by non-Jews, that the Jew must become a national man before he becomes an international man. This might be true if he lacked the inner unity which I have already mentioned; he happens not to need nationality. And enthusiasts have informed me that the alien must accept the leadership of the Jew in Palestine ("alien" means "present inhabitants" as it did in Alsace in 1871) and that the Jew will assert his independence of British influence in time, by violence if necessary. Then, firm in his nationalism, he will give the world the new internationalism. This is fairly bad thinking: the two great leaders whom the Jews have given to the world came one before, and one some years after, the Jews were a strong and independent state. And to me it sounds very much like saying that I must kill my father in order to repent magnificently of parricide.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Pantomime and the Picture

By ALFRED B. KUTTNER

THE motion picture is like Topsy; it "jes' growed." It grew up in an atmosphere of contempt and abuse, and it is therefore not surprising that even its finest achievements still show traces of this unfavorable environment. But like Richard III it also grew hardy, and those who formerly abused it owe it an apology as they now approach it to share in its triumphs.

Left to itself without any critical guidance or any craftsman tradition, it was at first only natural that it should follow the path of least resistance. The motion picture began by being imitative and sought to achieve the same excellence that had ennobled the theater, without stopping to question whether it could successfully make these excellences its own. It could not, however, long avoid the realization that it depended upon continuous action much more so than the spoken drama. In examining the various forms of drama it therefore quite naturally came to prefer the melodrama, where action predominates, often at the expense of plausibility and characterization. In other words, it set out by imitating the lowest form of drama.

Curiously enough it paid very little attention to pantomime. This is partly explained by the fact that the elaborate pantomime has never made much headway in this country. We have known pantomime here only in its debased form, as it has come to us from the English circus, after pantomime had fallen into disrepute with the passing of the great Grimaldi. Our circus clowns, the degenerate descendants of this renowned figure, have never had any high standing among us, lost as they usually were in the welter of elephants, snake charmers, and exotic acrobats. Such occasional performances as that of "L'Enfant Prodigue" and similar stories appeared too sporadically in this country to have any marked effect, and such pantomime ballet operas as "Sardanapal" and "Coppelia," followed by the performances of "Cléopatre" and "Scheherazade" by the Russian Ballet, also came too late.

This was a distinct loss in the development of our screen art. For the natural relation between motion pictures and pantomime is very close. Of all the dramatic forms the pantomime most nearly approximates the motion picture. The stage version of a good pantomime resembles a scenario to such an extent that it could safely be placed into the hands of the director and the photographer with practically no important changes except perhaps of emphasis. It is conceived purely in terms of action and has the advantage over melodrama of much greater plausibility, because as a rule a pantomime deals with a long accepted story which has passed through many hands and through many interpretations, until the residuum becomes the very essence of a swiftly moving plot. In fact, pantomime in its most highly developed form can be defined in terms of that famous definition of poetry which requires poetic creations to be always "simple, passionate, and direct." Pantomime is the very poetry of action.

The other point at which pantomime influences the motion picture is in the interpretation before the camera. On the Anglo-Saxon stage, where acting has been so largely confined to the lips that we may reverse a current piece of slang and say that our actors are usually "dead from the neck down," we have almost been led to forget that pantomime is really the core or backbone of acting, without which it would be difficult to differentiate acting from mere recitation. The screen actor, deprived of his voice, was compelled to return to this fundamental technique of his craft. For him there was nothing to do except to mime. As soon as he did this he liberated his body from the galvanized state in which our drawing-room school of acting had confined it. For it is impossible to express any strong emotion entirely through the facial muscles. The body is inevitably drawn into sympathetic action.

Our actors had to undertake this task afresh. They had to work out what was for them a new technique in the hurry and strain of the studio, under a director who insisted that they should "register," with only the haziest notions of the difference between conventional stage business and genuine pantomime. What they needed, and what they almost entirely lacked, was any tradition of sustained pantomimic interpretation.

Under these unfavorable circumstances this improvised school of pantomime was bound to have certain defects. Pantomime in its raw state necessarily suffers from exaggeration, being at first an impatient effort to supplement the inadequate verbal expression of a state of mind or feeling by means of bodily movements. The natural progress from bad pantomime to good is from exaggeration to subtlety without loss of clearness. The pantomimic action must always be sharp and definite and in just proportion to the force of the emotion it is meant to portray. The growth of certain traditions in pantomime and the inheritance of accepted, forms like the gradual development of the outwardly conventional figures of Harlequin and Columbine, have given pantomime that classic quality, as distinguished from mere spontaneity, which every art must have. The audience requires some inkling of the intent of the mimicry before it can appreciate the personal style of the artist and the individuality of his interpretation.

We have recently had opportunity to observe the happy effect of previous training in pantomime upon foreign actors, in watching their work in a series of notable pictures beginning with "The Cabinet of Doctor Caligari." Their performances show sustained rhythm and a mimetic eloquence of rare distinction. They never indulge in mere hurry in order to conceal defects in true dramatic action, and yet skilfully avoid those fatal dead spots where inadequate mimetic interpretation gives the banal title writer a new lease of life. They understand the eloquence of deliberate repose and the dramatic value of subtle changes of rhythm. An excellent indication of the degree to which they have mastered their new medium is the notable lack of camera consciousness in their work. They act in terms of true cinegraphic art, not as if they were being photographed in a theater.

This close relation, both of form and technique, between pantomime and motion pictures is strikingly illustrated in "One Arabian Night," now being shown in this country. For here we have a picture which recalls a recent pantomime that has already become a classic. "Sumurun," it will be remembered, was a pantomime directed by Reinhardt which Winthrop Ames presented with the original cast in 1912 in New York, where it eclipsed every other play of the season through its dramatic sincerity and the novelty of its settings. Apparently the present picture was suggested by "Sumurun," though "Sumurun" itself is a composite of several legends taken from the Arabian Nights. To see this remarkable picture is to marvel at one more of the many mysteries of motion picture production. For how is it possible that such a treasure house of stories as the Arabian Nights should have been so long neglected?

Those who retain a fond memory of the pantomime will remember that it was distinguished chiefly for the swiftness and sureness of its action, its clear characterization, and the poetic treatment of the love story. The plot was complicated, for it dealt with the infatuation of three men for the same woman and her variations of treachery and favor toward each one of them, a dark and passionate theme standing out in dramatic contrast against the idyllic romance of the princess and Nur-Ed-Din the silk merchant. Yet the story was successfully conveyed to an audience unaccustomed to pantomime, through an entirely wordless performance lasting over two hours.

Under the skilful direction of Ernst Lubitch the picture version of the story retains these same virtues to a remarkable degree, and adds a pictorial quality which make it a real cinegraphic contribution. Mr. Lubitch has a way of achieving his effects legitimately. He creates his atmosphere out of the natural background of the story and lets his actors move fa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miliarly against their given environment. In the harem scenes, for instance, where nine out of ten of our native directors would have shown us an assortment of more or less oriental beauties disporting themselves in a pool under the watchful eyes of our censorship boards, he is content to make us see how the lives and manners of women are inevitably determined in a society where women are habitually kept under lock and key. He does not avoid sensuousness and abandon where they are called for, but by conceiving them realistically, as part of a story which mirrors a life different from ours with different standards of morality, he makes his picture censorproof without sacrificing its artistic integrity. That is in itself an accomplishment from which our directors may draw salutary conclusions.

The action, complicated though it is, remains clear by virtue of a treatment which lavishes the very miniature of detail upon the action of each particular scene. Lubitch does not waste time with an elaborate building up of effects. He makes each scene clear in itself and then hurries on to the next, with the result that he draws his audience with him. It is as if he had no patience with the lazy spectator. This is characteristic of all his work, and it has been interesting to see how frequently his audiences in this country, jolted out of their comfortable attitude in which our average pictures sedulously keep them, go to see a Lubitch picture a second time.

"One Arabian Night" is sustained throughout by the transcendent acting of Pola Negri. This remarkable artist, whose work proved so arresting in "Passion" and in "Gypsy Blood," interprets the role of the slave girl so as to make her a kind of Oriental Carmen who exploits men to her own ends until the passions which she has aroused destroy her in turn. Her sharply outlined presentation completely dominates the picture. In "Sumurun," it will be remembered, the net effect was to center the play in the story of the hunchback's tragic love for the dancing girl and make it a kind of allegory of ugliness passionately seeking to forget itself in beauty. "One Arabian Night" is more balanced through this change of emphasis. In a cast of great excellence Pola Negri stands out as a star not because she is always pushed forward in a conspicuous position but because her work is truly outstanding.

In the Driftway

IT is autumn, and it is cooler, and the Drifter rejoices. The days of his vest are at hand again. The heat of mid-August never troubles the Drifter, but the utter pocketlessness of the mere male in hot weather drives him half crazy. His pencils and his fountain-pen drop from his coat pocket; his watch chain gets twisted in that inadequate hole known as a trousers watch-pocket; he has no place for his knife, and the side pockets of his coat become clogged with a mass of clippings, notes, letters, and memoranda which in the orderly and vested days of winter are carefully assorted through the abundant pockets of his waistcoat. No poet can convince him that there are melancholy days at hand; the snug sense of a five-pocketed vest tells him better.

* * * * *

THE country is, after all, growing up. Time was when we listened to Fourth of July orations and believed in them. Time came when they merely bored us. Now comes the Indianapolis *Star*, already grown to full-fledged and mature imperialism. The Irish talk of "consent of the governed;" whereat the *Star* comments:

This is one of the phrases of the Declaration of Independence that sounds very well but needs to be interpreted in the light of facts; just as the assertion that all men are equal does, or the inalienability of the right, for example, to pursue happiness.

And further:

Under the American empire we have a graded system of dependencies, from Cuba, let us say, nominally independent, down to Guam, which is a crown colony, pure and simple.

The Drifter must admit that he has not yet grown to such maturity that he can talk complacently or even listen complacently to talk of the "American empire" and of its "crown colonies." But he has not yet reached threescore and ten; perhaps he will learn.

* * * * *

THE Drifter's friends, the editors of *The Nation*, recently committed most egregious injustice. The Boston *Herald* reported as a "special dispatch to the *Herald*" that Lord Northcliffe had so suffered from the heat in Washington that he had been obliged to change his clothing three times in a day, not to mention the formal change to dinner clothes at night. The editors ventured a few remarks about Washington correspondents and the cultural diet served with codfish balls at Boston breakfast. Whereat the Washington correspondent of the *Herald* protests, and justly. The *Herald's* "credit line" was misleading; not its special correspondent at Washington wrote so explicitly of Lord Northcliffe's perspiration, but the correspondent of the New York *Times*, whose service the *Herald* buys. Even New Yorkers read of Lord Northcliffe's troubles as they cracked their white-shelled breakfast eggs. But more than that. The Chicago *Tribune*, the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, the Milwaukee *Sentinel*, the Plattsburg *Gazette-Times*, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, the Montreal *Gazette*, the Toronto *Globe*, the Winnipeg *Free Press*, the Vancouver *Province*, and 300 papers in Australia all buy the *Times* Service, and readers in all those democratic commonwealths were privileged to read, as they sipped their democratic coffee, that a peer of the British realm had "perspired so freely that he was obliged to change his clothing three times." The Drifter apologizes for his friends the editors to the Washington correspondent of the Boston *Herald*. But fine, very fine indeed, is the news nose of the correspondent of the New York *Times*.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Konrad Nies

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Thank you for the editorial epilogue devoted to Konrad Nies. As far as I can see no other American magazine written in English has taken any notice of the passing of our greatest German-American poet. Even the newspapers have not published a single line about this gifted writer. Your appreciation of him is so much the more to your credit, and I am encouraged to beg your hospitality for a few more words about a dear friend departed. You have written understandingly of Nies, but you apparently missed the development of his genius during the last years of his life, which was very evident to his personal friends and is most magnificently reflected in some of his later verses published in "Welt und Wildnis," the last volume of his works, printed in Germany. He was most anxiously waiting for it from day to day, having advanced, under great difficulties, the cost of printing and even of shipping. He did not live to see it. It came the very day after he closed his eyes. In this later poetry an entirely new melody is apparent: the melody of his own heart, his own fully developed deeper and better self. All his former poetry was graceful and often very alluring, but it closely followed the footsteps of Geibel, Heyse,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other epigones of the German classics. Only toward the close of his life did he leave the beaten track and enter the wilderness where he reaped flowers of great and lasting beauty and fragrance. They were all the children of his pains. Most truly could he say what Goethe said about himself:

"Mir gab ein Gott zu sagen was ich leide."

For years he was suffering from broken health, and it is the greatest of wonders that he survived so long and carried on his poor, weak body by the mere strength of will and his superior philosophy. He was also suffering mentally. All the distress and anxiety which the German-Americans had to bear during and after the war fell most heavily upon his tender heart; extreme poverty followed him to the very grave, and also that lonesome feeling, that vain craving for recognition which is the fate of all true artists in this sad time of sham and decay.

But all these woes were only rain and sunshine for the growth of his soul which flowered and bore fruit to the very end. No bitterness, hardly ever a plaintive sound, entered his verses; all suffering was distilled into the clear and mellow wine of resignation, without despair, without pessimism, without bitterness, but full of hope of a better future, a fuller and freer life after death, not in the sense of the dogmatic teaching of the Christian church, but in the spirit of the Vedas. His was

"Der stille Glaube, dass aus Last und Leid
Zuletzt ob Höhen, blauen, licht geweihten,
Die Seele heimwärts geht durch Raum und Zeit
Zum ewigen Sonnenreich der Weltbefreiten."

Now his warm and full heart has ceased to beat; soothing Death took him gently by the hand and led him away from this cruel world, granting at last the wishes expressed in the poet's deepest and most impressive verses:

"Nicht lass aus Grossmut mich am Wege stehn
Heiss mich in Lebensfülle mit dir gehn."

San Francisco, September 4 FERDINAND FREYTAG

Some Mooney Case Personalities

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of August 24 The Arbitrator reprints part of an open letter by one Martin Swanson in defense of the Mooney frame-up. Swanson is identified as an "assistant prosecutor." He was a Pinkerton detective in the employ of San Francisco public service corporations, and for some weeks preceding the bomb outrage had been trying to "get" Thomas Mooney and others suspected of a hand in blowing up the towers of electric power transmission lines.

Mr. Swanson's letter, distributed by the Better American Federation and probably prepared by one of its agents, is primarily an attempt to bolster up the credit of F. C. Oxman, the "honest cattleman" from Oregon, who testified that he saw Mooney and Billings plant the bomb. Even as the record stood when it was written, last April, such an attempt could succeed only with those ignorant of facts that are now common knowledge in San Francisco.

A few weeks after Mr. Swanson's epistle, additional facts were presented to the San Francisco grand jury which make it clear that Oxman not only tried to suborn perjury when he wrote the Rigal letters, but that he committed perjury himself when he testified that he stood on Market Street at a few minutes before 2 o'clock on July 22, 1916, and watched Mooney and Billings deposit the bomb concealed in a suit case. One E. K. Hatcher, a cattleman of excellent reputation who lives at Woodland, California, has broken a long silence to testify that Oxman arrived at his home at Woodland that morning, stayed for lunch, took a nap, and then walked to the station and boarded a train for San Francisco that had arrived at Woodland at 2.08 p.m., or two minutes after the bomb exploded in San Francisco ninety miles away. Hatcher walked to the station with him and saw him board the train.

Why did Hatcher hold his tongue? He says that Oxman's dramatic appearance as chief witness at the Mooney trial six months later amazed him and put him in a quandary. He took Mooney's guilt for granted. He suspected that Oxman had injected himself into the case because of the old man's vanity and thirst for publicity. They had been associated in several cattle deals, and when Oxman was exposed as a suborner of perjury a few weeks later he met Hatcher and said to him: "They are going to try to put the old man in jail. Are you going to stand by me?" Hatcher, solely devoted to his personal and family interests, dreaded the notoriety attached to participation in the Mooney case. Then two agents of the defense called at his home in his absence and talked roughly to his wife. This angered him. When Oxman was tried for subornation of perjury, Hatcher was persuaded to go to San Francisco and sign some sort of an affidavit ready-prepared by Oxman's lawyer. He says he hardly knows what was in it. Now he has "come clean." Hatcher's home is within an hour's motor ride of Governor Stephens's office. There isn't any question in the minds of those who have talked with him that he is telling the truth. He has finally told it without any inducement other than the satisfaction of clearing his conscience.

The Swanson letter, which has been widely circulated, is embarrassing to the writer of this communication only because it gives him an absurd prominence as an agent in blocking the Mooney frame-up. I'd be proud if the facts justified it. The truth is my early report on the case was of insignificant value, and that since then I have done nothing. This is in contrast with two instances of disinterested devotion to justice that to me excel in interest any other feature of this case. Robert Minor devoted a year to the defense when the going was hardest. An orthodox, hard-headed lawyer associated with McNutt in the Mooney defense, a man entirely out of sympathy with Minor's radical views, said to me the other day: "There's a sweet character! Brave as a lion, gentle as a woman, he'd give his last cent to anyone who needed it. His pamphlet, 'The California Frame-up,' saved Mooney's life." The other is Maxwell McNutt, chief defense counsel. A fastidious tory in every impulse, McNutt showed himself a brilliant young prosecutor as one of Fickert's assistants when Fickert took office in 1910. But he couldn't stand for Fickert, and resigned. The Mooney case was put up to him, and his disgust with Fickert's methods opened his mind to the early evidence of a frame-up. He took the case. His determination was aroused, and he has hung on fighting for five bitter years during which his practice has been all but destroyed. Large sums poured in for the defense, but they were expended in the countless investigations, not only to prove his clients innocent, but to attempt to find the guilty. McNutt is a poor man because of his defense of Mooney, and for five years he has been a lonely man. Disdainful of sentiment, facing the world a little scornfully, temperamentally in antipathy to radicals, humanitarians, and laborites, he has held these groups at arms length when their adherence might have compensated another man for the sacrifices he endured. He has never uttered a word of complaint. He is still fighting.

Oakland, California, August 29 GEORGE P. WEST

John Fiske on War

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In one of the volumes of John Fiske I have just come across the following opinion which, in view of the present international consideration of limitation of armament, is pertinent. Over fifty years ago this esteemed American scholar and historian wrote: "We still live in an age when war is, to the imagination of some persons, surrounded with false glories," and "with the progress of civilization the time will doubtless come when warfare, having ceased to be necessary, will be thought highly criminal."

Saginaw, Michigan, September 16 C. H. IBERSHOFF

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Facts Made to Order

The High Cost of Strikes. By Marshall Olds. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

MR. OLDS has written a book to prove that "non-production due to strikes was the *basic cause* of high prices after the war." As a result of this conclusion, and others about the general uselessness and obnoxiousness of organizations of labor, he recommends that striking unions be prosecuted and dissolved under the Sherman law, and that the public support the "open shop" drive. Now, however absurd this thesis may seem to those of us who have noticed the immense dislocations and destructions of war, the profiteering, the inflation, and the wastes of production and distribution due to mismanagement, Mr. Olds's book cannot be ignored. Much of its contents was originally given wide circulation by the New York *Tribune*, and it now appears between cloth covers under the imprint of a reputable publisher. It gives an edge to so many prejudices and interests that many persons will take it to be authoritative.

Mr. Olds has rendered the task of examining his arguments unduly difficult by his trick of making unqualified assertions—statistical and otherwise—without citing any authority. A first reading of the book showed me that he was in error about numerous matters of which I happened to have personal knowledge. But in order to be perfectly fair I decided to test his first chapter, which is a crucial one, and about the truth of which I happened to be ignorant. This chapter furnishes a good sample also because it concerns a subject on which statistical information is easily available. I went to the obvious and authoritative sources of information, and conducted the same sort of research that would have been necessary in preparing to write such a chapter. The result follows.

The chapter deals with "strikes and the high cost of food." It charges that in April, 1920, everyone in the Northeastern section of the country paid over $4 more per barrel for potatoes because of a strike of dock workers on steamship lines running into New York from Southern ports. It charges that the high prices of sugar in the spring of 1920 were entirely due to strikes in the sugar industry. It charges that a strike raised the price of tuna fish. It goes on to say that "parallel examples of how strikes were the direct and sole cause of definite and big increases in the prices of meat and butter and rice and eggs and milk and practically every other necessity of life could be cited almost indefinitely." The unsuspecting reader is led to infer that strikes caused the high prices of food after the war.

Let us begin with the potatoes. *The Market Reporter*, issued weekly by the United States Department of Agriculture, states in its issue of July 23, 1921: "New York City's main-crop potatoes come mostly from two States, New York supplying 5,926 cars and Maine 3,048. Michigan, contributing 468 cars, is the only other main-crop State from which the city receives more than 150 cars." The main crop, therefore, comes from Northern States, and could not have been interrupted by a strike on Southern steamships. Continues the *Reporter:* "Practically the entire supply of the intermediate crop is furnished by New Jersey, which ships 2,048 cars to New York." The intermediate crop also, then, was not interrupted by this strike. "Of the early crop, 3,747 cars come from Virginia, 1,007 from Florida, 867 from South Carolina, and 716 from North Carolina." From Bermuda come 618 cars. Perhaps this early crop was, therefore, interrupted by the dock strike. But let us see. The article goes on to state that the Bermuda crop usually arrives during April, the crop from the Carolinas in *May and June*, and the Virginia crop in *June, July, and August.* And by July the Long Island and New Jersey crops are also selling. The only potatoes which the strike could have kept back in April were therefore those 618 cars from Bermuda, which sell at fancy prices anyway, and comprise but 3 per cent of New York's yearly supply. A few pages further on there is still more damaging information. "Except for some of the Norfolk stock which arrives by the Old Dominion boat line, early barreled shipments arrive in New York City at the Pennsylvania Railroad piers." So that if any of the Florida or Carolina potatoes did happen to be ready by April they would have come by rail anyway. They might possibly have been interrupted by the outlaw railroad strike, but that is another story. The truth is that most ordinary New Yorkers eat old potatoes until late in the spring at least. If prices go up in April, as they certainly did in 1920 (they went up also in February and March), it must be due to a shortage in the old crop rather than in the new one.

How about the country's potato crop of 1919—which furnished the bulk of the potatoes sold in the spring of 1920? It was, according to the United States Department of Agriculture Year Book of 1920, 355,773,000 bushels, as against 411,860,000 bushels in 1918 and 430,458,000 bushels in 1920. It was therefore at least 60,000,000 bushels short, or about 14 per cent under normal. No wonder prices went up as the old potatoes began to give out! They went up about the same amount not only in New York, which was affected by the strike, but in Baltimore, Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, and almost all other points in the United States, which were not in the least dependent on those Southern steamship lines. Whoever wishes to consult in detail the official record of these price quotations will find them in *The Market Reporter* issued during the spring of 1920. They prove beyond a doubt that Mr. Olds's terrible potato story is unadulterated buncombe.

On page 11 Mr. Olds says that Cuban sugar cultivators worked only about one-third of the time because of high wages, thus presumably lessening the production of sugar. On page 12 he says that in 1920 there were strikes among operatives transporting sugar and in sugar refineries. "During January, 1920, there were seven separate and distinct strikes that handicapped production or distribution and so increased the price of sugar." These strikes continued. Yet on page 13 Mr. Olds writes: "There was no shortage of sugar in 1920. More sugar was produced and Americans consumed more sugar than at any time in our history." Is Mr. Olds telling the truth on pages 11 and 12, or on page 13? Apparently he cannot even carry his logic for three pages. As a matter of fact, he is telling the truth on page 13. This being the case, it is difficult to see how prices could have been raised by interference with production due to strikes in 1920. In so far as a shortage had anything to do with high sugar prices in 1920, it was the shortage of the previous crop. The crop which workers were handling in 1920 caused a terrific slump in prices, as anyone may see for himself by consulting the records.

I have not checked him up on tuna fish, because it is such a relatively unimportant article of diet. Yet it is on these three instances alone that Mr. Olds bases his generality that strikes raised the price of food. The United States Department of Labor keeps records of the prices of the twenty-two main articles of diet throughout the United States. By examining this record (*Monthly Labor Review*, April, 1921, page 20) anyone can see that potatoes and sugar are the *only* articles of food which showed great increases in price in the spring of 1920. The combined index number for these twenty-two commodities, including potatoes and sugar, went up only from 201 to 219 between January and June, 1920, a rise of about 9 per cent. And then it went down to 178 in December. Apparently Mr. Olds chose out of the twenty-two cases the two that would look worst, and then set to work to blame labor for their rise, regardless of all the authoritative and easily ascertainable facts.

So far I have been able to cover only the first fifteen pages of this amazing book. In order to expose all the untruths and misleading statements, which follow thick and fast, I should have to write a volume larger than the book itself, and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

research necessary to establish the facts would doubtless take more time than the author spent in preparing the book, for it would involve consulting the records, a task which he seems lightly to have ignored. Certain glaring inaccuracies should, however, be mentioned. The first is in his preface, where in order to establish his fair-mindedness he writes: "The author has been a laborer—on a farm, as assistant in a railroad repair shop, as a dock walloper, as working boss of a gang, and as an assistant machinist. Except for hiring his own stenographer and occasionally an assistant he has never been an employer." He fails to add that he has been an advertising man and a publicity agent for numerous employers engaged in controversies with labor organizations. The next is in chapter two, where he maintains that a strike of clothing workers in the fall of 1919 was responsible for the rise in the price of clothing. He figures that 4,000,000 less suits than normal were made that year, by multiplying the total number of man-days lost by the "average production per day." Even if his figure of the number of days lost is correct—I have not checked it up—the figure for average production per day is purely mythical. How many suits a clothing worker produces in a day depends on many factors, including styles, efficiency of the shop, etc., and any such average is wholly meaningless. If we should accept his figure of about 2½ suits a day, and multiply it by the number of workers in the industry and the number of working days in a year, we come out with the absurd total of over two hundred million men's suits a year. Of course the author overlooks the fact that the clothing industry is one of the most highly seasonal of all industries, and normally loses so many possible working days that time lost by a strike may easily be made up. He does not mention that although the strike took place in New York and Chicago, it did not interrupt production for a moment in one of the largest factories in Chicago, that of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, for the very good reason that this concern had recognized the union years before and had developed a means of adjusting disputes peaceably. He says that the introduction of the 44-hour week "and other production concessions" made to the union decreased production at least 35 per cent. But there were no "production concessions," and the records of the Taylor Society contain reports showing that production increased in Rochester after the introduction of the 44-hour week. Production did decrease in New York—though not elsewhere—because in New York the custom of paying by the week rather than by the piece was practiced. But that is another story, and it is incomplete without adding that the union itself recognized that this was an undesirable state of affairs, and at its 1920 convention voted to introduce production standards.

He represents the outlaw railroad strike as a carefully planned bit of strategy on the part of the unions, to cripple transportation as by a slow and concealed fire. This strategy he thinks particularly dangerous, and concludes: "the obvious defense is not to wait for such attacks but to put out of action in advance the weapon through which they are made"—i.e., the unions. The fact, of course, is that the unions did their best to stop the outlaw strike—hence its very name—and that it was a spontaneous revolt of the workers, arising because the union organizations could not secure prompt enough attention for their grievances. Such outbreaks are dangerous, but they are exactly the sort of thing that is bound to happen increasingly as unions are suppressed or destroyed.

It would be unfair to impose further on the patience of the reader by pointing out the many falsehoods and inversions of fact which the author has managed to crowd into his pages. We can only offer the warning that no single statement made by Mr. Olds should be accepted without the most careful verification. There have been many books of propaganda issued in the past few years which paid little attention to truth, but most of them concerned distant regions or events regarding which the facts were not readily ascertainable. For the publication of this book there is not the slightest excuse—it is, to anyone who has any real knowledge of the subject of which it deals, a most transparent piece of chicanery. To accuse the author of having deliberately falsified in the interest of the reactionary employer would be easy, but beside the point. His is the type of mind which in the long run does little damage except to any cause which is so unfortunate as to enlist his support.

If a competent writer had been assigned to this thesis, could he have made out a good case? Many have been the attempts to assess the cost of strikes, and most of them have concluded that while exact figures or anything like them are impossible to secure, the total, however estimated, seems large only when it is not compared with preventable wastes and losses from other causes—such as "normal unemployment." The loss of working days due to strikes in 1919—an abnormal strike year—as quoted by Mr. Olds from the United States Department of Labor, was 134,300,000. This is about 1.1 per cent of the total possible working days of the gainfully employed population. Compare it, for instance, with the probability that from four to five million have now been unemployed against their will for at least six months—a loss of three-quarters of a billion working days. And who was responsible for the strikes? For a small light on this, compare the Department of Labor's index numbers for union wage rates with those for the cost of living since 1913, and you will see that pressure from the workers was necessary even to maintain a losing struggle with rising prices. Beginning both series in 1913 on the basis of 100, they run as follows:

Year	Union Wage Rates	Cost of Living
1913	100	100
1914	102	103
1915	102	105.1
1916	106	118.3
1917	112	142.4
1918	130	174.4
1919	148	199.3
1920	189	216.5

Strikes are indeed inconvenient and expensive, and they should, if possible, be avoided; but they cannot be avoided by attempting to destroy the labor movement, which has had its roots in our soil for the past hundred years and has continually grown stronger, in spite of much bitter opposition. Strikes cannot be altogether done away with, but the way to minimize them is plainly in evidence for all who wish to see. It is to recognize the unions and give them responsibility, to develop collective bargaining and arbitration machinery which shall resolve conflicts of interest so far as possible by the application of principles of common humanity to facts scientifically ascertained. Until employers are ready to make this basic concession they have only themselves to blame for industrial conflict.

GEORGE SOULE

Truth on the Run

Gold-Shod. By Newton A. Fuessle. Boni and Liveright.

THE awakening critical spirit is, like most things among us, too apt to be in a hurry. You may have sharp and accurate perceptions in a flash. To absorb and record them takes quietude and time. There is a patience more of the spirit than of the mere act of composition that marks all imaginative narrative which approaches true excellence. That patience must not be abandoned if the new attitude and insight of some of our recent fiction is to be fruitfully sustained.

Mr. Newton A. Fuessle has clear vision, large experience, and the power of accurate and telling reflection. "Gold-Shod" gives evidence that he has within him the materials for an American novel of epical proportions and tragic irony. The book that, in its present shape, he actually gives us, strikes one a little as though it had been written on a subway express. He jumps and skips and fidgets. You think he is going to exhaust a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation or a character. Before it is half attempted he escapes. He does not stop for closeness or for adequate expression or for the silence of creative moments. It is all intention.

But the intention is everywhere admirable and very rich in possibilities and that is the reason, of course, for our dwelling on the discrepancies in Mr. Fuessle's product. He had, at the outset, three quite magnificent motives—the American history through three generations of a line of German ancestry; the effect of a definite type of marriage on the character and activity of men; the growth and expansion of the automobile industry. It is clear at once how these three motives are interwoven. The founder of the line, Dr. Anton Glinden, is a gentle idealist, half musician, half man of science. That strain lives on in his son and grandson. But both marry ambitious American women—ambitious for money and social prominence and the success of their men as measured by these things. Anton Glinden's son goes under in this conflict between his true nature and what is demanded of him. Fielding Glinden, the grandson, spurred on by both his mother and his wife, breaks with the poetic loitering of his boyhood, enters the young automobile industry, and becomes a millionaire and a magnate. But the ghost of old dreams and inherited impulses haunts him to the end. At the height of his dazzling career he is filled with a sense of emptiness and irony. When, upon America's entrance into the war, the nation's Chief Executive calls him to an important administrative post, the newspapers make a great deal of the "purity of his private life." Glinden, as a matter of fact, forsaken by dreams and art and love, has for years yielded to a half-aesthetic sensualism as his one refuge and anodyne. It is a situation great in irony and in cultural and human significance. Mr. Fuessle makes little of it, as he makes little of anything. He is in a hurry.

There are characters in "Gold-Shod"—Beth and the Blasphemer and fugitive women on Glinden's path—that cling to the mind; there are episodes—like Glinden's last flight from the world's gorgeousness to his own soul—that go very deep and are beautifully rich in implications. But all these things are fragmentary, unfinished, abrupt. There is so much talent among us—Mr. Fuessle's is of a high order—and so little understanding of the creative processes and the creative life. Speed and cleverness and half-journalistic English are sheer waste. Let Mr. Fuessle read Somerset Maugham's "Of Human Bondage," let him read Thomas Mann's "Buddenbrooks"—there are similarities to his own fable in that great story—and then let him take off a year or two and go to quiet places and listen carefully to that which is within. Only so can memorable work be done. But we believe that Mr. Fuessle can do such work.

Books in Brief

THERE is a growing volume of liberal-minded Catholic literature on social problems. To it belongs "The Morality of the Strike," by Donald A. McLean, M.A., S.T.L., with a preface by the Rev. John A. Ryan, D.D. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons). For the general reader the book may seem to be pretty heavily laden with quotations from Catholic moralists. This very fact will doubtless give it value for those for whom it was written. The author argues that the morality of the strike depends upon the concrete conditions accompanying a given strike. It is, for example, moral to strike for a living wage or even for somewhat more than a living wage. The author holds, however, that a strike to secure 100 per cent of the product would be unjust. It is also just to strike for more wholesome working conditions and shorter hours and, under certain circumstances, for union recognition. Never, however, is it right, in the opinion of the author, to strike to abolish the institution of private property or the authority of the state. Sometimes sympathetic strikes are justified, but a general strike would be unwarranted. If the state should forbid strikes the state would be acting unjustly unless it could provide adequate means for the protection of the workers, a task which is by no means easy. The author urges labor legislation and especially the development of democracy in industry with the sharing of control and profits. Such a program will not wholly commend itself either to the thoroughgoing conservative or to the thoroughgoing radical. It is, however, a valuable indication of the trend of thought within a powerful church.

FRANCE, with its tradition of precise Versailles gardens and its remoteness from frontier conditions, has neither the popular interest in wild things nor the long list of popular "nature books" which are so characteristic of this country. Perhaps it is not without significance that her greatest popular naturalist, J. Henri Fabre, should concern himself chiefly with the ineradicable insect fauna, least of all touched by the advance of civilization. "More Hunting Wasps" (Dodd, Mead and Co.) is one more in the long series of translations of Fabre's genial, fascinating, semi-philosophical, and sometimes just a bit loquacious studies in his garden. Those who know the rest of the series will relish these almost as much as the classic studies of ants, spiders, and bees. Fabre's "Animal Life in Field and Garden" (The Century Company), deliberately written down for children, lacks much of the charm of these other books. Our naturalists may lack something of Fabre's philosophy but they know more of child psychology. America remains supreme in the field of children's books. Fabre, when he attempted to instruct Jules by a story, wrote in a vein reminiscent of the Rollo books. Mabel Osgood Wright could have given him lessons.

THE mystic element is one of the strains in poetry that is not born to die; and anybody who has a real feeling for verses of the past will welcome the appearance of a volume entitled "Studies in Islamic Poetry" (Cambridge University), with special reference to mysticism, by the well-known Persian and Arabic scholar, R. A. Nicholson. Professor Nicholson is an acknowledged master in the art of translating, and his excellent renderings of the "Meditations" of Ma'arri, which make up most of the volume, convey a clear impression of the mystic reflections of this blind poet who died in Syria nearly nine hundred years ago. The translations are made the more valuable because accompanied by the original texts from which the skilled versions are made. But even more welcome for lovers of Persian poetry are the forty-two pages that constitute the first part of the volume, because they make available in English the material of the famous Persian anthology, Aufi's Lubab, with its flowers of verse twined in a garland still unfaded after nearly a thousand years. For instance, in a fragmentary poem of Unsuri, descriptive of a battlefield swept by the flashing sword of Mahmud, "Allah-breathing Lord," occurs the image:

> Look how gold and silver Pleiades
> Bestud the rolling sky of scimitars,
> And how, like dagger's pearl-encrusted haft,
> Each baldrick shows its blazonry of stars!

This is Persian in its graphicness. But there is much in these old poets that might awaken new fancies in the imagination of modern writers of verse. FitzGerald once found it—and for all time!

MR. ALBERT COYLE, official reporter for the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, has accomplished the really tremendous task of preparing for publication at his own expense and on his own responsibility the full transcript of the evidence presented at the hearings of the Commission entitled "Evidence of Conditions in Ireland" (Washington: The Author). This record makes a remarkably interesting volume. The book is well printed and well indexed and inexpensive. It presents in available form facts and opinions which no one can ignore who wishes to understand the Irish situation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

The Native Theater

THERE is an imitation of nature that is flat and dead, a type of naturalism that incurs the old reproach of being photographic. It is rare, since men who write are commonly men of strongly marked character and individuality of vision with whom to observe and to create is one. Instinctively such men transcend the moral and intellectual universes within which their characters live and their creative processes are guided by a critical spirit. We can recall no case of the contrary attitude so clear and certain as that offered by the revival of Mr. Eugene Walter's "The Easiest Way" (Lyceum Theater).

In 1908 "The Easiest Way" was welcomed as the first naturalistic play of the American theater. And it did, indeed, render the surfaces of life with a new accuracy. But this surface accuracy is now seen to be its one virtue. It left the illusions with which men hide reality untouched. Mr. Walter saw things; he made no effort to see through things. He dispensed with a raisonneur, with any choric character, not because he had, like the great naturalists, the power of infinite critical implication, but because he had literally no comment to make. He accepted the world seen by his creatures. He has apparently accepted that world ever since. Thus is to be explained the fact that "The Easiest Way" had no successor, that Mr. Walter followed it with melodramas of the most vulgar kind. He has had nothing more to say because, essentially, he never had anything to say at all.

The case he stated in "The Easiest Way" was, in itself, not without truth or importance. Brockton is the American *moyen homme sensuel* with his peculiar code and his bit of derivative sentimentality done to the life; John Madison is the average moral hero in his own conceit. He is proud of not having gone under and revenges himself on his shady past by being merciless; Laura Murdock is a common sentimentalist posing to herself as a tragic figure. But Mr. Walter is taken in by all three. To him Brockton is a rather terrible villain, Madison a good man and not a cheaply self-righteous one, Laura a beautiful soul destroyed by a tragic fatality. Thus he stated his case despite himself and beyond his own power of dealing with it. And that is what makes the play seem old-fashioned without being old and barren for all its accuracy of detail today. The creative comment is lacking, the voice from beyond the illusion, the mind that stands above the characters and sees that their unhappy fate springs not from the circumstances of a lasting order but from the web of falseness in which they are caught.

How far we have progressed since 1908 may be observed from "The Hero" by Gilbert Emery (Belmont Theater). In the matter of mere accuracy of detail Mr. Emery betters the example of Mr. Walter. The speech of our lower middle classes has not been rendered with a more striking exactness. But everywhere and at every moment you hear the murmur of the creative overtones. The words are themselves and their own comment, the expression of the characters and also the author's ironic or tragic criticism of that expression and of the moral and emotional sources from which it springs. The title of the play offers an elementary example of this process. Oswald Lane comes back from the war and plays the part of a hero and is accepted as a hero even by his mother and brother who have had to pay so bitterly in the past for what he really is. To his brother's wife he brings with that glamour of warlike glory all that she misses in her humdrum life and her humdrum husband. But the audience shares the author's great secret at once. Oswald Lane has physical courage enough, since he has neither earnestness nor imagination. But all the people around him are taken in. The war has not changed him. He has all his old impudence, sloth, dishonesty, and careless sensuality. Only his old shame is gone. Is he not a hero? His brother's wife, who is almost ready to throw herself into his arms, catches him red-handed. She is merciful as she has been sinful and lets her husband and his mother nurse their vision of a purified and ennobled Oswald to the end. But she awakens from her illusion; she comes squarely upon the author's secret and the audience's that the plain carrier of the daily burden who faces sacrifice and defeat and hope deferred with invincible cheerfulness and love is the true hero of her life's play. It is when, through the creative imitation of reality, the illusions of both the audience and the characters are pierced and corrected that we have true naturalism. It is when "we dead awaken" that art comes to life. It is a great pity that Mr. Emery, like Miss Akins in the last act of "Daddy's Gone A-Hunting," permits himself the use of a violent catastrophe. But like Miss Akins he keeps his central and controlling intention uncorrupted to the end. Considered within the circle of the contemporary American drama "The Hero" is a play of first-rate excellence and the interpretation of the chief parts by Robert Ames and Richard Bennett a beautiful illustration of realistic acting at its best.

Other current native plays are worth only the briefest comment as they exemplify the commoner kinds of theatric trading. Miss Fannie Hurst in "Back Pay" (Eltinge Theater) undertakes to tell over again the story of Pinero's "Iris" and "The Easiest Way" and Selwyn's "The Mirage." She, of course, accepts all things and sentiments at their face value and emphasizes old untruths with hectic stridency. She aims at eloquence and falls into rant. She is luscious and meretricious and bombastic. She deals entirely in explosive antitheses that correspond to nothing. "Two Blocks Away" (George M. Cohan's Theater) by Aaron Hoffman is the typical made-to-order play. It is a mere garment for that admirable actor Barney Bernard, but it is an ill-fitting, cheap, and shoddy one. In "Only 38" (Cort Theater) Mr. A. E. Thomas continues his policy of furnishing innocuous entertainment to the unthinking respectable. But his little fable is sounder and less soggy than was the fable of "Just Suppose" and will furnish really healthy entertainment for adolescents. An agreeable curiosity is Mr. E. M. Royle's "Launcelot and Elaine" (Greenwich Village Theater). Mr. Royle has deftly though rather sweetishly dramatized an episode from the "Idylls of the King" which is the reverse of austere even there. But he has transferred to the stage many of the speeches which Tennyson assigns to his characters throughout the "Idylls." And it will, we believe, come as a surprise to many that these speeches when delivered on the stage are charged with high vividness and with unquestionable dramatic aptness and force.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

The Fall Book Supplement will be published with the next issue of THE NATION.

Third Edition, Revised and Rearranged in One Volume

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY

by

H. G. WELLS

$4.19

R. H. Macy & Co. Inc.

Herald Square New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Japan in Eastern Siberia

"QUESTIONS relating to Siberia" appears on the agenda for the coming conference on armaments, and the specific question of Japanese activities in eastern Siberia is sure to come up for discussion. The documents printed below indicate the extent and results of Japanese aggression since the counter revolution at Vladivostock which occurred late in May.

On June 7 a note protesting against Japanese interference was addressed to the Foreign Minister of Japan by Mr. I. L. Yourin, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Far Eastern Republic. The text of the note, reprinted in the *Chinese Illustrated Review* of June 11, reads in part as follows:

On May 21, 1921, the officers of the Russian militia at Vladivostok discovered a band of criminals who had arms stored in the house of a Japanese citizen. The militia officers were unable to arrest that criminal band in view of the forcible and wilful interference of the Japanese gendarmes. The Russian militia had at that time been reliably informed of an anti-government uprising which was being organized at Vladivostok. The Japanese Command, which was aware of these preparations, not only did not prevent the illegal arming of those criminal elements implicated in the preparations, but, on the contrary, on May 26, the day of the uprising, surrounded the militia and the People's Defense Guard and required them to turn over their arms, while no measures were taken against the outlaw bands. Nor did the Japanese Command prevent the occupation of the government establishments by the agents of Semionov who were set free by the Japanese Command. . . .

The Government of the Far Eastern Republic, on behalf of the entire people of the Russian Far East who elected it, requests of the Japanese people and the Imperial Government of Japan a straightforward and definite answer to each of the following questions:

1. Do the Japanese Government and the Japanese people consider just the constant interference of the Japanese Command with Russian affairs against the will of the Russian people of the Far East?
2. Will the Japanese Government continue to help the criminals and brigands of the bands of Semionov, Ungern, etc., and put obstacles in the way of the authorities in their struggle against those bandits?
3. Does the Japanese Government consider it necessary to establish friendly neighborly relations with the Government of the Far Eastern Republic?
4. Does the Japanese Government consider it necessary to protect the interests of the Japanese merchants in the territory of the Far Eastern Republic in the only possible way, namely, by entering into a commercial treaty with the Government of the Far Eastern Republic?
5. Does the Japanese Government intend to withdraw from the territory of the Far Eastern Republic its army of occupation, the presence of which in Russian territory, as has been sufficiently proved during the last three years, has in no way helped to establish friendly relations or to secure any privileges for Japanese residents, but on the contrary has been the source of a growing hatred toward Japan?

We hope that for the sake of a better understanding between the two peoples the Japanese Government will not delay in giving straightforward and definite answers to all these questions.

We believe that the Japanese Government will choose a more righteous course in its relations with the Russian people. We firmly believe that a definite end will be put to the shameful policy of usurpation and violence and that the Japanese Government will enter into just and sincerely friendly relations with the Russian people. The Government of the Far Eastern Republic is convinced that such a settlement will be to the benefit of the Japanese people. While welcoming the friendly settlement of all outstanding matters the Government of the Far Eastern Republic categorically demands:

1. A definite statement of the Japanese Government and the Japanese Command that it will refrain from supporting the self-styled "Government" of Merkulov at Vladivostok. The Government of the Far Eastern Republic is convinced that this adventure is doomed to failure.
2. The Japanese Command shall immediately return all arms to the Russian militia and the People's Defense Guard.
3. The Japanese Command shall not prevent the Government officials from arresting criminals and taking other necessary measures to restore order.
4. The Japanese Military Command shall not put any obstacles in the way of the local authorities of the Far Eastern Republic or of the district emissary of the Government, Mr. Kozhevnikov, the Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, who has been ordered to proceed to Vladivostok, in restoring order and protecting the lives of the foreign citizens residing in the territory of the Far Eastern Republic.

At almost the same time diplomatic intervention on the part of the Soviet Government of Russia, in the form of a note from Mr. Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to the French, British, and Italian Foreign Offices, was announced. The text, which was dated June 1 and published in the London *Times* of June 10, follows:

The struggle of the toiling masses of Russia for peace and for the right of self-determination has been subjected to a fresh trial. After gigantic efforts and miracles of heroism, after having valiantly repulsed the united attacks of the internal counter-revolution and of the majority of the foreign Powers, they have won the right to govern themselves by their own soviets of workmen and peasants. They hoped that henceforward they would be able to devote themselves freely to the internal reconstruction of Russia, whilst cooperating with other countries in their mutual interests in order to attain the economic aims which lay before them.

Unfortunately, their hope has been shattered by a fresh attempt at intervention from outside, and a fresh combined attack of the Russian counter-revolution and foreign Governments. Under the protection of Japanese bayonets the White Guards of Vladivostok, who are only a handful, suddenly seized power in that town, and a similar coup has been carried out at Nikolsk, Oussouriisk, and in other localities in the Japanese occupation. The extreme counter-revolution has thus been reinstalled by the Japanese military power in the district under their occupation.

The masses of Russian workers and peasants of the Far East have done all in their power to secure an acceptable peace with Japan. They have formed a separate democratic republic in order to render this peace possible, and with this object the independent Far Eastern Republic signed an agreement with Japan, who was prepared on this condition to withdraw her troops from these areas or (*sic*) to restore their liberty to the Russian masses of the Far East.

In the name of these latter the Government of their Republic has made indefatigable efforts to secure a complete agreement with Japan, so that it might live with her in peace and in good neighborly relations; but the Japanese Government replies to its efforts after peace with a fresh violent attack on its internal liberty and its external independence. The worst enemies of the Russian masses, the extreme reactionaries, whose avowed aim is to conquer Siberia with the aid of Japanese bayonets and there to become the lieutenants of the Japanese conquerors, have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been raised to power by violence in those places where the domination of the Japanese armies extends.

But this first step toward an attempt at the conquest of Siberia is not an isolated instance. The Japanese Government has distributed to the capitalists of its own country fishing rights in the waters of Kamchatka, which hitherto belonged to the Russian cooperatives and to others of our citizens. Japan is introducing her control, she is seizing the dues imposed on the fishing areas of Kamchatka; this is an arbitrary seizure, and a pillage of the wealth of Russia, which the Russian Government regards as a violation of the elementary rights of the Russian masses.

At the same time it is with the aid of the Japanese military power that the remains of the counter-revolutionary bands of Semionov and Kappel are maintaining themselves on the borders of China and are occupying the Chinese Eastern Railway; and it is with the assistance of Japanese auxiliaries that the bands of Ungern are terrorizing Mongolia, and are there preparing their attacks against the Russian Republic. The agents of Japanese imperialism are penetrating even into Central Asia, where they are trying to propagate their sedition, and the emissaries of the counter-revolutionary elements of Turkestan are hastening to Japan to elaborate their plans together.

The Russian Republic time after time has reiterated its peace proposals to the Japanese Government, but, in spite of all its efforts after peace, the Japanese Government is at the present time the instigator of a fresh campaign of intervention against the power of the workers and peasants. The Soviet Government, which represents their will, warns the Japanese Government that the mighty Russian masses, who have taken their destinies into their own hands and have repulsed all the attacks of their enemies, will know how to wage to a victorious conclusion this fresh struggle, and will not fail to make their vigor felt by those who attack them.

But the responsibility for these hostile acts cannot be confined to the Japanese Government alone. There are proofs in existence that the French Government, in its implacable hostility against the power of the workers and peasants in Russia, is an active instigator of this fresh campaign of intervention, and is participating in the plan of Japanese conquest in Siberia. Soviet Russia cannot but regard all the Powers of the Entente as morally responsible for this fresh link of the interventionist system, which is the joint work of the Powers of the Entente. It sees in it, on the part of the British Government, a hostile activity not in accordance with the Anglo-Russian Treaty. The Russian Government protests in the most energetic fashion against these acts directed against Russia, either directly or through the medium of the friendly Far Eastern Republic and reserves the right to draw from it the obvious conclusions.

On June 9 Lord Curzon caused the following brief reply to be dispatched:

I am directed by Earl Curzon of Kedleston to return to you as unacceptable your communication of the 4th instant respecting recent events at Vladivostok. It is neither customary nor conducive to good relations that one government should in this manner and without adducing any corroborative evidence address entirely baseless charges to another, and his Majesty's Government must, therefore, decline to enter into any correspondence with you on the matter.

Meanwhile the state of affairs in the Maritime Province following the Merkulov coup is indicated in a letter alleged to have been written by Ataman Semionov, long regarded as a tool of the Japanese command. This letter, addressed to General Tachibana, commander-in-chief of the Japanese expeditionary forces, originally appeared in the *Golos Rodini*, a Vladivostok Cadet paper, and was reprinted in a Harbin dispatch to the Far Eastern Telegraphic Agency ("Dalta") of July 10. The letter also bears out a number of previous dispatches describing the inability of Semionov to come to any agreement with the Merkulov Government which was installed in Vladivostok after the counter-revolution. The Ataman is represented as writing:

Your Excellency from my latest reports is aware of the negotiations with the so-called government of Merkulov Bros., which with my assistance seized the power in the Maritime Province and is now trying to prevent me from pursuing the sacred cause of struggling against the Bolsheviki for the reestablishment of Russia, and, along with this, for the interests of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of the Japanese Empire and his subjects. With these interests always in view, as is well known to the Imperial Japanese Command from our common long struggle in Transbaikalia, I am now obliged to see how successfully the Communists in the Maritime Province are moving toward a recovery of their power. Thanks to the ambition of the unstatesmanlike Merkulov and Bros., together with their followers! . . .

Having exhausted all peaceful means of reaching an understanding with Merkulov for the reconstruction of the government, I have failed, and this failure undoubtedly will have an unfavorable effect not only upon the interests of the Russian Far East, but also upon those of Japanese residents, the Japanese Government, and its economic policy. All these can be advanced only under my rule of the province. . . .

Your Excellency can now observe the rule of the Merkulovists, the absolute unsuitability of that apparatus which is not an outgrowth of the requirements of the political situation and which does not correspond with the interests of the Allies, who want to see the establishment of a buffer state, a wire entanglement, as it were, to safeguard the capitalist economic positions against the destructive epidemic of communism. My program of administration, outlined to Your Excellency at Mukden on January 23, was prompted by vital political consideration, and I venture to remind Your Excellency that the losses suffered by the Japanese army will be reimbursed, in the event of the continuation of intervention to help my army in the struggle against communism. The meeting of the expenses will take the form of territorial annexation, the extension of conventional trade privileges, and special treaties in return for the friendly assistance to a neighbor country.

The Merkulov Government has no such intentions and does not approve of my methods of struggle against bolshevism, which are well known to Your Excellency; and as a result of this a band of 2,500 armed men has been organized at Imam, which is attacking the detachments loyal to me, thus preventing me from struggling against communism.

Right now in the Maritime Province insurrections of partisan detachments are taking place everywhere, and it requires a popular leader to check this movement speedily, a task which is very difficult even for the disciplined Japanese Army on account of the peculiar character of the partisan detachment and the impossibility of developing the activities of a large organized army.

Having repeatedly expressed my views, I for the last time appeal to Your Excellency for assistance if not for active support in the struggle with the Bolsheviki. I hope that Your Excellency's aide-de-camp, Major Sinken, who was present at the last conference of the commanders loyal to our forces on Russian Island, has reported to Your Excellency the results of the conference.

I venture to ask your Excellency to convey this official letter to Count Uchida and also to inform me as soon as possible of your opinion regarding the subject of the letter.

The Merkulov Government, which dissolved the existing popular assembly as soon as it assumed power, made preparations for the convocation of a new legislative body—a move which was strenuously opposed by the partisans of the deposed government. Here is the conclusion of an appeal issued by the Board of Directors of the Maritime Province (the administrative officials of the deposed Vladivostok Gov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment) at Imam on July 10. The appeal is signed by Mr. Antonov and Mr. Petkus, respectively, chairman and secretary of the Board of Directors.

Citizens of the Maritime Province, the Board of Directors empowered by your elected representatives asks you not to submit to the so-called Merkulov Government and declares that any person who may render service to it will be proclaimed a traitor. The Maritime Provincial Administration will reconvene the Maritime People's Assembly on July 25 in the city of Imam and invites all members or their lawfully elected successors to be present. The Board of Directors will render a detailed report of all its activities to this assembly and only to this assembly will it submit its authority.

Citizens, the Board of Directors implores you to struggle against the usurpers of the will of the people by all peaceful means; and, in case they are insufficient, resort to arms! The present state at Vladivostok threatens to bring about a new war not only in the Maritime Province, but in the entire Far East, and we must prevent it now.

The elections to the Merkulov assembly seem to have been generally boycotted by the workers of Vladivostok and the Maritime Province. An extract taken verbatim from the Overseas Weekly Edition for July 1 of the Vladivostok *Daily News*, a strongly anti-Bolshevik paper published in English, indicates that the workers had little confidence in the new government.

On June 26 the laborers and workmen of Vladivostok held a meeting at which the question of whether or not the workmen should take part in the elections into the National Assembly had to be discussed.

The Conference was opened at 11 a.m. The hall of the Narodny Dom was filled to the limit; the public, representatives of the press, of political parties and trade unions were present.

The election of the presidium being made, the speaker was given the word on the question of the workmen's attitude toward the elections into the National Assembly. No sooner had the speaker uttered a few words, than a representative of the militia arrived at the hall, and after a short consultation with the president, declares that the authorities "propose" that the meeting be closed.

The Chairman then addressed the auditory and announced that the authorities insist upon the Conference being closed. "And if we do not submit?" "Then a militia detachment will be brought into the hall," replied the Chairman. "Then let them bring the militia detachment, but the conference goes on," decided the greater majority. The militia official retired.

Now the Conference must hurry up and decide upon the election question. Two orators were allowed five minutes each—one for participation in the election, the other, against. The Social-Revolutionist Plekhanov was in favor of participation in the elections, qualifying the boycott of the elections as a political suicide. But he had no success, and under cries from the crowd "Merkulovists" he left the tribune.

The other orator is against any new elections, pointing out that there is no guaranty for free expression of the people's will, no freedom of press, and no guaranty for the inviolability of the deputies. "We have," said the orator, "a legal Government of the Far Eastern Republic to which we submit and to no other. We don't need any other Government, and therefore any elections."

The orator left the tribune under applause.

The representative of the militia then returned and stated that he had informed the authorities that the Conference does not want to leave the hall. The Conference continued, and the question of participation in the elections was balloted; 225 voted for the boycott and 7 for participation. The result met with continued applause. A resolution was passed protesting against the violence upon freedom of meetings. Again the militia appeared. The Chairman then announced on behalf of the President of the Government the meeting has to be dissolved and a list of the participants rendered, otherwise force will be applied.

"We can only submit. I consider the meeting as closed."

The participants of the meeting hereupon left the hall.

Only 19,334 votes were cast in these elections, as against 29,000 in the elections for the preceding legitimate assembly, which was dissolved after the counterrevolutionist coup. Of these 19,000 votes 6,000 were cast by the imported Kappel soldiers, so it would appear that more than half of the citizens of Vladivostok and its environs who voted in the previous election stayed away from the polls. Even under these conditions Merkulov does not seem to have secured an altogether submissive assembly. According to a Dalta dispatch of August 7 the peasant faction in the Merkulov assembly presented the following list of demands to the government, threatening to withdraw from the assembly if they were not satisfied:

The Government must immediately enter into negotiations with the strike committee, and comply with the just demands of the strikers. All political offenders must be released from prison and further arrests must be discontinued. The Government must come to an understanding with the Iman District Government and the Maritime People's Assembly [both apparently organs of the deposed government] for the purpose of convoking a provincial assembly in accordance with the law of 1917. The Maritime Province must remain an integral part of the Far Eastern Republic. Political liberty must be immediately restored and organs of self-government must be reinstated. The militia must submit to the city and district organs of self-government. The sale of foreign goods stored in Vladivostok as well as negotiations for foreign loans, unless they are sanctioned by the People's Assembly, must be stopped.

In the meantime the provisional administration set up by the officials of the deposed government at Iman seems to be functioning as a rival to the Merkulov Government in the Maritime Province. The following news item was sent out by Dalta from Chita on July 27:

The Far Eastern Republic provincial administration of the Maritime Province commenced to function at Iman on July 21. The People's Assembly opened at Iman on the day set by Mr. Antonov with a full quorum. Many members of the Assembly have not yet arrived, among them the old members now in Chita, who are leaving the capital for the present seat of the administration of the Maritime Province. A group of old members of the Maritime People's Assembly, including Communists, Social Revolutionists, Menshevists (among the latter is Mr. Binassik, Minister of Justice) will leave Chita for Iman. One of the first matters to be acted on by the third session of the People's Assembly at Iman will be the election of a new board of directors or the retention of the old one by sanctioning the acts of Antonov's government since the Vladivostok overthrow.

The campaign in Mongolia against the White Guard bands of General Ungern-Sternberg and his Japanese officers and military advisers was successfully carried on by the Mongolian revolutionary army with the help of Soviet Russia and the Far Eastern Republic. Following his defeat and the dispersal of his troops General Ungern-Sternberg was captured late in August and taken to Moscow; a recent dispatch states that he has been executed. During the campaign the Russian Soviet Government sent two notes on the subject of its intervention and the presence of its troops on Mongolian soil. The first, addressed to the Chinese Government, follows:

On June 15 the Russian Soviet Government, which during its entire existence has repeatedly given proofs of its desire to continue friendly relations with its neighbor, the Chinese Republic, declares now as one of the principles of its foreign

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy the maintenance of full respect for Chinese rights, and at the same time calls attention to the common enemy, Ungern, the leader of the White Guard bands now operating in Mongolia. His attacks on the armies of Soviet Russia and of the Far Eastern Republic developed into extensive military operations and forced Russian troops to cross the Mongolian frontier. The opposition to Ungern is in the interest of China, because by taking this task in hand the Russian Republic at the same time gives support to China, assisting her to crush these bands and maintain her authority. The Russian Government categorically declares that only with this purpose did it take measures against the traitor Ungern; and likewise declares that, when this purpose shall have been fulfilled, the troops will be withdrawn from Mongolia. By taking arms against Ungern the Russian Government confirms its friendly relations with its neighbor, China.

At approximately the same time a note was sent to the "Soviet Republic of Mongolia" acceding to its request for military aid. According to a special dispatch appearing in the New York *Times* for August 16, the note was in the following terms:

The Soviet Government and the allied Far Eastern Republic have ordered troops to defend the provisional people's government in Mongolia, and utterly to crush the common foe, General Ungern, who attempted to enslave Mongolians, seized their territory, and threatened Soviet Russia. The advance of the Soviet troops in Mongolian territory has the exclusive aim of crushing the common foe and ending forever the common peril to the Mongolian Soviet Government, which is now taking the first conscious steps on the road to free and independent government.

It is with deep satisfaction that the Soviet Government accedes to the Mongolian request for aid, and promises its troops will not leave Mongolia until the last vestiges of Ungern's forces are eliminated. The Soviet Government has firmly decided that its troops will only leave the territory of autonomous Mongolia when the common foe is totally beaten and no danger to the Mongolian Government, united in bonds of friendship will the Soviet Government, remains. The Soviet Government agrees with the Mongolian Government that this hour has not yet come, and it is for these reasons that it is determined to grant the request of the Mongolian Government.

The Soviet Government is convinced that common efforts both against the Czarist generals and foreign exploitation will be crowned with success in the near future and allow free development of the Mongolian people on an autonomous basis through organization of the people's revolutionary republic. On that basis there will be formed a firm and lasting alliance with the Soviet Government.

In coming issues
of the International Relations Section

Persia's Answer to Lord Curzon.
Repression in the Jugoslav State.
France in Syria.
Secret Telegrams from the Russian Foreign Office Files.
Agreement between the Italian Socialists and the Fascisti.
The Italian Government and the Sacco-Vanzetti Trial.
A Mexican Land Law.
And other important documents.

Never Since the Prosecutions of Radicals Began

has the legal defense work been so crippled for lack of funds.

¶ The I. W. W. Defense Committee, which carries the legal and relief work of 103 federal prisoners and several hundred State prosecutions, has been forced to stop even the meager $10.00 weekly allowances to prisoners' families, and to discontinue much necessary legal aid.

¶ The National Defense Committee, which handles Communist cases, can give only scattering relief to the wives and children of men held for deportation or in prison, and is unable to meet even the pressing demands of court cases.

¶ These two national defense organizations handling the great majority of free speech cases are in desperate need. There are local defense groups in equal distress. Unemployment makes impossible the continued working-class support of the defense work.

¶ The friends of free speech who helped in emergencies before will not abandon those prosecuted for their radical faith. The American Civil Liberties Union calls on their behalf for funds.

¶ $5,000 is urgently needed for immediate obligations. All money received will be placed in the hands of an Emergency Defense Committee, which will distribute it to the various defense committees for the cases and the work in most urgent need.

¶ That Emergency Defense Committee consists of Robert Morss Lovett, chairman, Albert De Silver, treasurer, Edward T. Devine, Robert Herrick, John Haynes Holmes, Mary E. McDowell, and Harry F. Ward.

¶ Those wishing to have their contribution used for special cases or needs should indicate it. Detailed reports of the disposition of all money received will be sent to contributors.

¶ Checks should be sent to Albert De Silver, treasurer, at 138 West 13th Street, New York City.

Tear out and use this blank

To ALBERT DE SILVER, Treasurer,
138 West 13th Street, New York City.

Enclosed find check for $....., my contribution to the legal defense and relief in free speech cases, to be applied by the Emergency Defense Committee. (If for special case or need, note here) .....

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is strictly a limited offer—on November 1 the price goes back to 25c each, the regularly advertised price. Every order is filled complete. Our stock manager reports there are no titles out of print. We are handling the rush with amazing efficiency. All orders filled 24 hours after they get on our files. There will be no delay on our part during this gigantic sale. But a delay on your part may mean you will miss the greatest book bargain ever offered the American people. Buy the entire set of 218 books for only $16.90. Think what a truly amazing book bargain this is! At regular price of 25c per volume, the entire set would cost you $54.50. Until November 1 you can get the set for less than one-third that sum. At ordinary book store prices, the equivalent of this library would cost you $150 to $500, according to paper and binding.

World's Greatest Books On Sale Till November 1

ONLY 10c EACH

To introduce our library of over 200 books to readers of *The Nation* we offer any of the following books at the unheard-of price of 10c each. Many of these books would cost from $1 to $3 if purchased in the ordinary way in expensive bindings. This is strictly a limited offer—on November 1 the price goes back to 25c each—the regularly advertised price. If the postmark on your envelope shows that your order was mailed after midnight of November 1, we shall be obliged to return your money. Order as few or as many books as you like—they are the best in the English language—and the entire library costs so little that you can well afford to order every book. Over three million of these books have been sold—tremendous production makes possible the extremely low price. Order by number—each book is preceded by a number—for instance, if you want Carmen, merely write down "21"—that makes it easy for you and insures more prompt delivery, as we handle all book orders by number. Send orders up to midnight of November 1.

Order by Number — **Take Your Pick at Only 10c a Book** — **Order by Number**

1 Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.
2 Oscar Wilde's Ballad of Reading Jail.
3 Eighteen Little Essays. Voltaire.
6 De Maupassant's Stories.
7 A Liberal Education. Thomas Huxley.
10 Shelley. Francis Thompson.
11 Debate on Religion Between John Haynes Holmes and G. Bowne.
12 Poe's Tales.
13 Is Free Will a Fact or a Fallacy? Debate.
14 What Every Girl Should Know. Mrs. Sanger.
15 Balzac's Stories.
17 On Walking. Thoreau.
18 Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow. Jerome.
19 Nietzsche: Who He Was and What He Stood For.
20 Let's Laugh. Nasby.
21 Carmen. Merimee.
25 Rhyming Dictionary.
26 On Going to Church. Bernard Shaw.
27 Last Days of a Condemned Man. Hugo.
28 Toleration. Voltaire.
29 Dreams. Schreiner.
30 What Life Means to Me. Jack London.
31 Pelleas and Melisande. Maeterlinck.
32 Poe's Poems.
33 Brann: Smasher of Shams.
34 Case for Birth Control.
35 Maxims of La Rochefoucauld.
36 Soul of Man Under Socialism. Wilde.
37 Dream of John Ball. William Morris.
38 Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Stevenson.
39 Did Jesus Ever Live? Debate.
40 House and the Brain. Bulwer Lytton.
41 Christmas Carol. Dickens.
42 From Monkey to Man.
43 Marriage and Divorce. Debate by Horace Greeley and Robert Owen.
44 Aesop's Fables.
45 Tolstoi's Stories.
46 Salome. Wilde.
47 He Renounced the Faith. Jack London.
48 Bacon's Essays.
49 Three Lectures on Evolution. Haeckel.
50 Common Sense. Paine.
51 Bruno: His Life and Martyrdom.
52 Voltaire. Victor Hugo.
53 Insects and Men: Instinct and Reason. Clarence Darrow.
54 Importance of Being Earnest. O. Wilde.
56 Wisdom of Ingersoll.
57 Rip Van Winkle.
58 Boccaccio's Stories.
59 Epigrams of Wit.
60 Emerson's Essay on Love.
61 Tolstoi's Essays.
62 Schopenhauer's Essays.
65 Meditations of Marcus Aurelius.
68 Shakespeare's Sonnets.
70 Lamb's Essays.
71 Poems of Evolution. Anthology.
72 Color of Life. E. Haldeman-Julius.
73 Whitman's Poems.
74 On Threshold of Sex.
75 The Choice of Books. Carlyle.
76 The Prince of Peace. Bryan.
78 How to Be an Orator. John T. Altgeld.
79 Enoch Arden.
80 Pillars of Society. Ibsen.
81 Care of the Baby.
82 Common Faults in Writing English.
83 Marriage: Its Past, Present and Future. Annie Besant.
84 Love Letters of a Portuguese Nun.
85 The Attack on the Mill. Emile Zola.
86 On Reading. Georg Brandes.
87 Love: An Essay. Montaigne.
88 Vindication of Thomas Paine. Ingersoll.
89 Love Letters of Men and Women of Genius.
91 Manhood: The Facts of Life Presented to Men.
92 Hypnotism Made Plain.
93 How to Live 100 Yrs. Cornaro.
94 Trial and Death of Socrates.
95 Confessions of an Opium Eater. De Quincey.
96 Dialogues of Plato.
98 How to Love.
99 Tartuffe. Moliere.
100 The Red Laugh. Andreyev.
101 Thoughts of Pascal.
102 Tales of Sherlock Holmes.
103 Pocket Theology. Voltaire.
104 Battle of Waterloo. Hugo.
105 Seven That Were Hanged. Andreyev.
106 Thoughts and Aphorisms. Geo. Sand.
107 How to Strengthen Mind and Memory.
108 How to Develop a Healthy Mind.
109 How to Develop a Strong Will.
110 How to Develop a Magnetic Personality.
111 How to Attract Friends.
112 How to Be a Leader of Others.
113 Proverbs of England.
114 Proverbs of France.
115 Proverbs of Japan.
116 Proverbs of China.
117 Proverbs of Italy.
118 Proverbs of Russia.
119 Proverbs of Ireland.
120 Proverbs of Spain.
121 Proverbs of Arabia.
122 Debate on Spiritualism. Conan Doyle and Jos. McCabe.
123 Vegetarianism. Debate.
125 War Speeches of Woodrow Wilson.
126 History of Rome. A. F. Giles.
127 What Expectant Mothers Should Know.
128 Julius Caesar: Who He Was and What He Accomplished.
129 Rome or Reason. Debate. Ingersoll and Manning.
130 Controversy on Christianity. Debate. Ingersoll and Gladstone.
131 Redemption. Tolstoi.
132 Foundations of Religion.
133 Principles of Electricity.
135 Socialism for Millionaires. G. B. Shaw.
136 Child Training.
137 Home Nursing.
138 Studies in Pessimism. Schopenhauer.
141 Would Practice of Christ's Teachings Make for Social Progress? Debate.
142 Bismarck and the German Empire.
143 Pope Leo's Encyclical on Socialism.
144 Was Poe Immoral? Sarah H. Whitman.
145 Great Ghost Stories.
147 Cromwell and His Times.
148 Strength of the Strong. London.
151 Man Who Would Be King. Kipling.
152 Foundations of Labor Movement. Wendell Phillips.
154 Epigrams of Ibsen.
155 Maxims. Napoleon.
156 Andersen's Fairy Tales.
157 Marx vs. Tolstoi.
158 Alice in Wonderland.
159 Lincoln and the Working Class.
160 Ingersoll's Lecture on Shakespeare.
161 Country of the Blind. H. G. Wells.
162 Karl Marx and the American Civil War.
163 Sex Life in Greece and Rome.
164 Michael Angelo's Sonnets
165 Discovery of the Future. H. G. Wells.
166 English as She Is Spoke. Mark Twain.
167 Rules of Health. Plutarch.
168 Epigrams of Wilde.
169 Church Property Be Taxed? Debate.
171 Has Life Any Meaning? Debate.
172 Evolution of Love. Ellen Key.
173 Vision of Sir Launfal. Lowell.
174 Free Speech Trial of Wm. Penn.
175 Science of History. Froude.
176 Four Essays. Havelock Ellis.
177 Subjection of Women. John Stuart Mill.
178 One of Cleopatra's Nights. Gautier.
179 Constitution of League of Nations.
180 Epigrams of Shaw.
181 Epigrams of Thoreau.
183 Realism in Art and Literature. Darrow.
184 Primitive Beliefs. H. M. Tichenor.
185 History of Printing. Disraeli.
186 How I Wrote "The Raven." Poe.
187 Whistler's Humor.
188 How Voltaire Fooled Priest and King. Darrow.
189 Eugenics. H. Ellis.
190 Psycho-Analysis — The Key to Human Behavior. Fielding.
191 Evolution vs. Religion. Balmforth.
192 Book of Synonyms.
195 How to Keep Well.
196 The Marquise. Geo. Sand.
197 Witticisms and Reflections of Madame De Sevigne.
198 Majesty of Justice. Anatole France.
200 Ignorant Philosopher. Voltaire.
201 Satan and the Saints. H. M. Tichenor.
202 Survival of the Fittest. H. M. Tichenor.
203 Rights of Women. Havelock Ellis.
204 Sun Worship and Later Beliefs. Tichenor.
205 Artemus Ward, His Book.
206 Debate on Capitalism vs. Socialism. Seligman and Nearing.
207 Olympian Gods. H. M. Tichenor.
208 Debate on Birth Control. Mrs. Sanger and Winter Russell.
209 Aspects of Birth Control. Medical. Moral. Sociological. Dr. Knopf.
210 The Stoic Philosophy. Prof. Gilbert Murray.
211 Idea of God in Nature. John Stuart Mill.
212 Life and Character. Goethe.
213 Lecture on Lincoln. Robt. G. Ingersoll.
214 Speeches of Lincoln.
215 The Miraculous Revenge. Bernard Shaw.
216 Wit of Heinrich Heine. George Eliot.
218 Four Essays. Jean Jaures.

Special Bargain.

We have a special proposition for those who order a complete set—218 volumes. The regular price after Nov. 1 will be $54.50 figured at 25 cents each. If you order the entire set before Nov. 1 we will let you have the 218 volumes for $16.90.

Sale Ends November 1 — **SEND YOUR ORDER TODAY** — **Sale Ends November 1**

While we have plenty of books to fill all orders, we advise prompt action. All books guaranteed—if you don't like them, send them back and we'll return your money. All books are clearly printed on good book paper, 64 to 160 pages each. Pocket size. Bound in heavy card cover paper. Remember this is a limited offer—closes November 1—send your order and draft, money order or registered letter today—if you order 20 books send $2—if 50 send $5, and so on. Postage prepaid on cash orders. Carriage charges collect on C. O. D. orders. Add 10c to personal checks for exchange.

E. H. Julius, Pres., Appeal Publishing Co., 107 Appeal Bldg., Girard, Kansas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED